DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 723 HE 002 516

TITLE Women on Campus: 1970; A Symposium.

INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for Continuing Education for Women.

PUB DATE 71

NOTE 69p.; Proceedings of the Symposium, Ann Arbor, Michigan, October 14, 1970

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Aspiration; College Students; *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); *Females; *Graduate Students; *Higher Education; *Psychological Characteristics; Social Discrimination

IDENTIFIERS *Michigan University

ABSTRACT

The symposium: Women on Campus, 1970, held at Michigan University on October 14, 1970, centered on 3 major topics: "Toward a New Psychology of Women"; "The Case of the Woman Graduate Student"; and "The University and Women." The papers that were presented concerning the first topic included: "Internal Barriers to Achievement in Women--An Introduction," by Elizabeth Douvan; "Psychological and Psychosomatic Responses to Oral Contraceptive Use," by Judith Bardwick; "The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women," by Matina Horner; and "Differential Impact of College on Males and Females," by D. Diane Hatch. Papers presented on the second topic included: "The Woman Graduate Student in Sociology," by Greer Litton Fox; "Graduate Women in Political Science--A Recent Research Study," by Sybil Stokes; "Discrimination and the Women Law Student, by Noel Anketell Kramer; "The Black Woman Graduate Student," by Grace E. Mack; and "A Graduate in Population Planning Looks at the Future of Women," by Carolyn Houser. The 2 papers on the last topic were: "reflections on the Future of Universities and of University Women," by Charles H. Tilly; and "Change for Women--Glacial or Otherwise," by Jean W. Campbell. Some recent research on women at Michigan is included in the report. (AF)

the university of michigan
center for continuing education of women

women on campus: 1970 a symposium

ED054723

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002 516

ED054723

center for continuing education of women

women on campus

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYMPOSIUM
OCTOBER 14, 1970

Louise G. Cain, Symposium Chairman

Morning Panel: Toward a New Psychology of Women
Noon Round Table: The Case of the Woman Graduate Student
Afternoon Discussion: The University and Women—What Directions?

The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Foreword

1970 marked the 100th anniversary of the admission of women to The University of Michigan. It marked a new thrust in the movement toward women's rights. In the United States and abroad it may have marked an important turning-point in women's ways of thinking about themselves.

The specific goals of the Center for Continuing Education of Women since its founding have been to recognize and to remove barriers to achievement for women students, to encourage research on women and their problems, and to work toward a more rational planning of women's educational needs.

The 1970 Symposium was designed by the Center to focus on the academic woman: her activities, her achievements, her problems, her future at this University.

Contents

Morning Panel: Toward a New Psychology of Women

Elizabeth Douvan: Internal Barriers to Achievement in Women–An Introduction 2

Judith Bardwick: Psychological and Psychosomatic Responses to Oral Contraceptive Use 4

Matina Horner: The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspriations of College Women 12

D. Diane Hatch: Differential Impact of College on Males and Females . 24

Noon Round Table: The Case of the Woman Graduate Student

Greer Litton Fox: The Woman Graduate Student in Sociology 32

Sybil Stokes: Graduate Women in Political Science–A Recent Research Study 36

Noel Anketell Kramer: Discrimination and the Woman Law Student . 39

Grace E. Mack: The Black Woman Graduate Student 42

Carolyn Houser: A Graduate Student in Population Planning Looks at the Future of Women 46

Afternoon Discussion: The University and Women–What Directions?

Charles H. Tilly: Reflections on the Future of Universities and of University Women 50

Jean W. Campbell: Change for Women–Glacial or Otherwise? 56

About the Speakers 63

Recent Research on Women at The University of Michigan 65

Morning Panel:
Toward a New Psychology of Women

Internal Barriers to Achievement in Women: An Introduction

Elizabeth Douvan

If we are seriously interested in changing the status of women in the world—enlarging their options, supporting their efforts to use their talents fruitfully and achieve the fullest possible self-expression and self-realization—we do well to look closely at where women have come from and where we currently are. We need to assay those social restrictions that limit women's opportunities, and we need also to look at the state of readiness of women themselves to move into areas of potential opportunity. For the barriers that prevent women from realizing their capacities fully are only partly external. Psychological conflicts, inhibitions, and anxieties about achievement and femininity are often equally powerful in limiting women's movement into areas where social change has opened access to real opportunities. The first symposium of the conference focuses on these internal and psychological aspects of the woman's situation.

A remarkable coherence emerges in the three presentations. Each of the panelists describes the results of her research on some aspect of female psychology. Professor Bardwick studies women's attitudes toward sex, contraception, and the reproductive system. Professor Horner analyzes conflict about achievement and the fear of success in highly competent women, and Miss Hatch looks at sex differences in the characteristics of students entering college and in the effects of the college experience on these same characteristics.

The range of the research reported is broad in both content and method. Yet the findings are consistent and lead to very similar conclusions: that needs for love and interpersonal intimacy are dominating motives in women, that women define themselves and derive self-esteem largely by their relationships to others, and that anything that threatens those crucial relationships—whether it be individual success, competitiveness, or personal standards regarding sex—will create conflict and anxiety in the woman and will be avoided in reality or by means of psychological denial. If a young woman's plans for personal achievement endanger her attractiveness to male peers, she is likely to change her plans toward more modest and more traditionally feminine goals. If her personal background and life history have made her feel that premarital sex is either wrong or

worrisome because of the risk of being deserted, the girl will deny this history and her negative feelings, if saying no to a boy means losing him. Any assertion of her autonomous self is likely to be abandoned if it is pitted against a love relationship, even when the relationship has little guarantee of permanence.

That girls count the self so slightly in their scale of values cannot fail to distress those of us who are interested in women's rights and equal opportunity—or for that matter, anyone who has a stake in any human values. The studies indicate that the girls themselves are distressed by it, that they buy security in relationships at a significant cost in anxiety, guilt, and damaged self-esteem. Professor Horner's findings indicate further that at least high ability women are often aware of both their distress and its sources.

This last finding seems to me a most hopeful sign and a strong support for social action. If the cost of self denial could be managed by the defenses so that it remained unconscious, education and increased opportunity would not hold much promise for effectively changing women's behavior. But when a girl or woman recognizes that her dissatisfaction stems from neglecting her self and her talents, she becomes a candidate for recruitment into arenas of personal achievement.

The studies highlight the reality of internal conflict about achievement, and lead directly to questions about the socialization of girls. We need to know much more about the subtle and complex forces in the socialization process that lead girls to develop these internal inhibitions against achievement and autonomy. Clearly this is one crucial direction for future research.

Psychological and Psychosomatic Responses to Oral Contraceptive Use

Judith M. Bardwick

When Joan Zweben and I began this study* there were few studies in the medical or the psychological literature about women's psychological responses to the oral contraceptives. But physicians had the impression that the easy acceptance or tolerance of the pill, or the marked rejection and physical discomfort experienced by some women, were due not solely to dosage levels, but also involved psychological dynamics. That was a logical hypothesis and we proceeded to explore this question using techniques that would measure the psychological variables that had been significant in previous studies of dysfunctions in the female reproductive system.

The three most important variables have been the following:

passivity, or the inability to express aggression directly,

dependence, or the need to perceive yourself as esteemed by others because that is your major source of self-esteem, and

denial, a primitive psychological defense in which reality is simply not perceived. The person who is very dependent upon others for feelings of self-esteem remains very vulnerable to rejection. The person who is unable to express hostility for fear of being rejected, is usually not as healthy psychologically as persons not significantly passive or dependent, and is likely to use the vulnerable defense of denial.

We were also interested in measuring levels of anxiety about sex, the psychological relationship to the body; feelings of trust or mistrust toward the sexual partner; goals, self-perceptions, what made the subjects happy, angry, or depressed; attitudes about contraception and the pills in particular, sexual responsiveness and sexual motives. In other words, we gathered all kinds of information which could conceivably have some relationship to the use or the rejection of this kind of contraceptives.

Because this was a predictive study, we saw each subject for about two hours before she began to use oral contraceptives. We administered the Franck Drawing Completion Test (a measure of unconscious body relationships), the Nichols Subtle Scale (a personality questionnaire that measures passivity), the Cornell Medical Index for Women (a detailed health questionnaire), and a standardized interview. Three months after the interview, after the subjects had three cycles on the pills, each one received a 4-card Thematic Apperception Test (measuring attitudes toward

heterosexual relationships, sex, passivity, dependence and maternity), and a detailed questionnaire about her responses to the pill.

The 150 subjects were volunteers from Planned Parenthood in Ann Arbor, and University of Michigan students recruited through newspaper ads. An additional 100 subjects were later recruited through ads in order to extend the population of TAT responses. The majority were unmarried or recently engaged, usually students, and overwhelmingly white, middle class. Because there was no choice about pregnancy in their lives - they simply could not afford to become pregnant—our subjects were extremely motivated to use oral contraceptives successfully.

What we found in brief was that girls who were insecure in the heterosexual relationship, who were not sure they could trust their partners, who were anxious or ambivalent about sex or pregnancy or maternity, who felt compelled to participate sexually but who did not achieve orgasm, who were passive and could not express their resentments, and who used denial, were very likely to report that they experienced no symptom reactions to the oral contraceptives. They were likely to report that the pills were psychologically beneficial, sometimes that the pills were "magic" pills, doing such wonderful things as making your hair grow longer. Consciously, in the interview and on the follow-up, these subjects looked extraordinarily happy. The unconscious data revealed startling levels of psychopathology, heterosexual mistrust, anxiety, and guilt.

So these subjects then are characterized by an absolute denial of fear and anger, a denial of body processes, a stereotyped description of their partner, their goals, sexual motives and experiences, maternal desires—and so on. There is a quality of exaggerated goodness or a "Pollyanna" quality to the responses of these subjects. All women reported body changes as a result of the contraceptives. What distinguishes this group is their exaggerated interpretation of these changes as beneficent or, after they report the physical change, as functionally non-existent.

Women who were psychologically more normal showed a wider distribution of responses to the body changes and the responses were less extreme than those of the more vulnerable subjects. Less anxious subjects tended to note the body changes, tended to respond to them as symptoms, tended to regard them as normal, and tended to have psychologically mixed but not extreme responses to the changes. More normal subjects were able to describe their fears about the pill and sometimes their dislike of the pill and accompanying body changes. Normal subjects who were aware of their ambivalence toward premarital sex, who were not pathologically anxious, who accepted the menstrual cycle, and who experienced some sexual arousability, found that they could accept the body changes resulting from the pills. They accepted the body changes but did not regard them as magically beneficent.

Anxious, guilt-ridden, passive subjects who did not use denial found the

body changes frightening and regarded them as pathological symptoms. Women who were anxious about sex, who were passive, who basically resented taking the pill but who used denial were able to deny their fears and resentments and perceive the physical changes positively.

Thus, responses to the body changes induced by the pills seemed psychologically motivated. Certain physical changes are common and attributable to the endocrine changes induced by the pills. Psychological responses showed a rare range of variability and seemed psychodynamically motivated.

But while individual responses to the pill reflected individual motives, we found that in this population taking oral contraceptives is itself a critically important behavior.

While we set out to study psychosomatic responses, what we had really was a study of morals, ambivalence, anxiety, and motives. We all know that sexual mores have been evolving since the 1920's–but they have not changed.

We know that girls have always been traditionally motivated during adolescence by heterosexual goals. Unlike adolescent boys whose primary task is the evolution of a vocational identity, adolescent girls have always defined achievement as the establishment of a stable heterosexual relationship. As Douvan and Adelson found in their study of adolescents during the 1950's, criteria for self-esteem change for girls at adolescence. The pressure to attract boys becomes competitively more important and crucial to feelings of self-esteem. Academic achievement goals become less important, and affiliation needs generally become more important. Our data of the late '60's support the idea that, like morality, girls' criteria for self-esteem have not significantly changed. Since girls still achieve identity within the affiliative relationship and are anxious within the relationship, this era of uncertain morality has tended to increase their psychological vulnerability.

We asked girls why they had chosen the pill as a contraceptive. The most frequently cited reasons were its safety, convenience, low cost, and the fact that it seemed least mechanical. At another level, motives for using the pill revealed attitudes and anxieties about sex. The most common response and hope was that the pill would reduce anxieties about pregnancy and *that* decrease in anxiety would enable them to become sexually aroused. Disappointment in sex was often attributed to fear of pregnancy.

"The pill will reduce tension."

"The pill will make sex spontaneous."

"I find I don't resent taking the pill like I did having to use the diaphragm. I don't feel like I'm preparing for sex when I take the pill."

"The pill is dissociated from the sex act–it's more natural."

"I expect my sex life to be very happy."

"I expect the pill to make me able to reach orgasm."

"It's convenient and I suppose psychologically I don't think of it as 'birth control,' but merely a type of medication I take every day."

We asked if the subjects had any worries about using the pill. Some women denied any fears at all, and that seemed to express a determination to use the most certain form of contraception in spite of negative consequences widely cited in the media.

Responses of the subjects after using the pills tended to reveal great fears which had not been expressed in the initial interview but could now be discussed because the changes were not as bad as those they had imagined. Some subjects, however, indicated continuing fear, sometimes expressed through responses to body change.

"I refuse to be scared. I won't have to worry. It's too easy."

"I feel like a hard woman because taking the pill is an admission of what I'm doing."

"I detest these changes! Every time I have to swallow one of these pills, I dislike the relationship we have a little more."

"The pill makes you aware of your sexual actions at all times."

"Sometimes when I take the pill in the evening, I think I'm doing something against my body which isn't natural–like I would take away something of my femininity."

"Before I took the pills I was kind of scared that I couldn't have as much control over myself as before."

"I feel that to males the pill is kind of mystical because it prevents pregnancy."

"I don't expect that I'll become promiscuous. If anything happens I won't credit it to the pills."

"I dislike feeling that I cannot control my body but a pill can."

"Premarital sex I can justify, but you take the pill when you're alone, not romantic–whether you like him today or not."

"I don't have any strong feelings about the pill. I take it with my vitamin pills and feel the same way about it as I feel about them."

"I now think of the cycle as a function of the pill."

"I have the feeling that the menstrual cycle is now mechanical, something I *caused,* not a part of me."

"The pill is not a tangible contraceptive."

We asked each subject the following question: "If there were a pill for men like the pill for women, which partner would you prefer to be responsible for contraception?"

Responses to this question tended to indicate levels of trust or mistrust in the relationship. Responses also revealed a certain amount of resentment that the male can enjoy sex without much responsibility, and the idea that contraception is threatening to the male ego.

"I think I trust him better than I trust myself. Maybe me–because if anything happens, it happens to me."

"Me . . . I trust him . . . but I like to know that I take them every day."

"Me. Because the girl would take pregnancy more seriously than the boy."

"Before marriage, me–after, I don't know. In an affair like this it can break up, he could go, anytime."

"Women, because the man is more excited and he'd be less responsible."

"My boyfriend wants me to use the pill because he sees it as a commitment to the relationship."

"I think I'd still take me because women are more likely to take them. Men don't like to take aspirin."

"Men. Let him have the responsibility. The woman gets pregnant."

"Men should. It's bad enough that I feel funny taking all the responsibility and he's not doing anything. They should."

"Men. Women have enough problems. Women have to have kids, take care of them, stay home. Men want sex, women do it because they love him."

"Theoretically him–but pills don't bother me. Men would be better, more successful–women have to take them continuously. Hits the source with men."

"Him–because I'm more moral. It bothers me more than it would him. And it would give him more of a commitment than me."

"Women–because it's her baby and it would take away the masculinity of the boy."

"Women. It might diminish his enjoyment."

"I'm afraid, psychologically, that a man would feel impotent if he took a pill–and I don't care for myself."

"Me, since he's rather absent-minded. But perhaps both for double control."

"I prefer to think of it as a joint responsibility. I don't think it's fair for just one to be responsible."

We asked our subjects: "Why do you make love?" Their responses suggest that the pleasures of sex *qua* sex are rather rare in this population. Many answers were stereotyped responses, part of the cultural milieu, but not really true for the individual. For example, one of those responses was, "For the physical release," but those same subjects reported never experiencing orgasm, or reported experiencing something "pleasant,"–which is not an orgasm–or, "I don't know if I have an orgasm,"–which also means no orgasm. Perhaps the most frequent response was their perception of sex as an important technique for communicating love in a relationship which they hoped was mutual, or the observation that if they did not participate sexually he would leave the relationship. For most, physical sex is impor-

tant because the male makes it important; for these women, sex tended not to be important in its own right.

Sexual motives tended to reveal general heterosexual motives.

"Because it's a means of getting closer to him."

"I guess because I love him."

"With him it's a giving, sharing, relaxing experience. If I say that I don't feel like it, he'll just hold me instead. The ultimate in being together."

"I enjoy it to a certain extent. If I like the person, I have a desire to please; desire to please rather than be pleased."

"The emotional commitment resulted in my having an orgasm."

"I enjoy it and it makes the other person happy."

"Right now to please him."

"If I didn't love him, I wouldn't enjoy it."

"A very social thing to do—a way of reaching people."

"I don't know. I think it's really necessary as a symbol of the involvement."

"It's pleasurable I guess. It's expected."

"I enjoy it. I envy men their freedom and ability to see sex with nothing else attached."

"I don't mind not getting excited or reaching orgasm. It's nice when it happens, but sometimes it requires more work than it's worth."

"It seems natural and because at this point it would harm the relationship not to."

"Mostly to see my boyfriend's enjoyment."

"He demands it."

"Besides the fact that it's a natural thing to do and we enjoy each other's company, we want to feel united—and it's the first time I made a decision without someone helping me."

"I hate to deny my husband although he's very good."

Very few subjects reported reaching orgasm, and there was a kind of conscious disappointment, but it wasn't terribly important. What was most important was the feeling of closeness in the relationship which they insure by their sexual participation. But that is dangerous because when you are not certain of the mutuality of the commitment, when you participate in sex primarily in order to secure love, or because you are afraid of losing love, your psychological vulnerability overburdens the sex act.

Overwhelmingly, our subjects reported that they made love with one "special" boyfriend toward whom they felt deeply committed, or else had intercourse with their fiancé or husband. In spite of the absolute contraceptive effectiveness of the pill, we saw very, very few subjects who made love with more than one partner. While sex is thus conceived of within a relationship, the assumption of contraceptive responsibility is nonetheless threatening, because it means that the woman must acknowledge her

sexual decision and can no longer perceive sexual activity as the result of some temporary, guiltless passion. Taking the pill can arouse anxieties about morality, and this anxiety and guilt are strongly defended against. In spite of any "sexual revolution," sex remains emotionally threatening, because this population gets so little physical pleasure from coitus, and because they are afraid that they have degraded themselves and will be abandoned because they are immoral. These anxieties were clearest in the TAT themes.

The TAT stories were returned with the follow-up questionnaire, after each woman had been using the pills for three months. Unfortunately, we could not get TAT responses prior to pill use so these are not measures of change. These are themes of stories written by women, most of them unmarried, after pill use.

The most frequent themes were:

Repetitive themes of men walking out.

View of men as argumentative, even violent.

Fear of rejection by males; mistrust of males.

View of sex as illicit, and the need to expiate guilt.

View of the male as using the woman uncaringly, for his own pleasure.

Denial of hostility to men.

Fear of abandonment, of deception, of rejection.

Prostitution fantasy with much shame and guilt.

Shocked by the extremely high levels of anxiety, hostility, and what looked like general pathology centering on sexual themes in these protocols, we tested another 100 young women. Their responses were basically identical to the first 150 and reinforce the idea that sexual anxieties and ambivalence are generally characteristic of this population.

The last question which I will discuss here (although I have not exhausted the data) are the responses to the question: "What would make you happiest?" Traditionally, women have derived a feeling of worth within their heterosexual and maternal relationships. It was surprising to find that although most subjects were college students, very few responded in terms of some professional achievement.

"Doing things with someone who enjoys me as I do him."

"To always have my husband and child."

"A woman is successful when she's at peace with herself, which is when you give up your career. The greatest satisfaction is in being a good wife."

"Having a child."

"To be receptive and give to others."

"When you bring out the best in others."

"Contributing to a meaningful relationship."

"Coming to terms with myself."

"Total self-actualization. That means a guy, family, job, and especially inner attainment."

"A toss-up between having my first child and pleasing my husband—which is probably the same thing."

"Getting kids raised and seeing they're happy."

"Really help people. I have a passion for helping people."

The population whom we saw in this study are largely preoccupied with the achievement of significant heterosexual relationships and with an identity within that relationship. They participate in sex within the context of the relationship, although they are often aware that they are incurring guilt by doing so. On the other hand, the anxiety of being abandoned if they did not participate sexually is perhaps even greater. They are defining themselves within the traditional roles as helpmate, wife, and mother, with some self-aware need to understand themselves and to achieve some level of confidence.

Assuming the responsibility for contraception within the context of an uncertain sexual relationship served to increase powerful, negative emotions. Profound but unconscious levels of anxiety about sex were evident in the 250 subjects whom we saw. We suspect that these levels of anxiety are characteristic for this population and are not confined to those who might be considered neurotic. On a conscious level some subjects report fears that men would leave if they refused intercourse, but on an unconscious level prostitution anxieties and fears of abandonment were the consequences of having slept with him.

Without self-esteem and an independent identity, this is an unresolvable conflict. Women with high self-esteem are more likely to participate in sex as free agents, less vulnerable to feelings of being used, because they have not let themselves be used. But the women whom we saw were characteristically dependent upon others for acceptance, were fearful of rejection, defining themselves, esteeming themselves, in terms of others' responses—especially of the men in their lives.

Based upon the subjects we have seen in this college generation, conflict over the sexual use of the body has not diminished, in spite of safe contraception and an evolving sexual freedom in this culture. The origin of the conflict lies in the girl's ambivalence toward her reproductive system, her vulnerability in interpersonal relationships, her difficulty in experiencing sex as a physical rather than a psychological involvement, and the residues of an older morality which are still powerful and which have been internalized as a standard of behavior.

*The study was made in 1967-8.

The Motive to Avoid Success and Changing Aspirations of College Women

Matina Horner

It has been about five years since, in an attempt to explain the major unresolved sex differences in previous research on achievement motivation, I first proposed the presence of the "motive to avoid success" as a "psychological barrier to achievement in women." I suggested, at that time, that women are anxious about success, and that the motive to avoid success exists and receives its impetus from the expectancy held by most women that success, especially in competitive achievement situations, will be followed by negative consequences for them. Among these are social rejection and feelings of being unfeminine or inadequate as a woman.

This concept was developed within the framework of an expectancy-value theory of motivation which argues that the most important factors determining the arousal of one's motives and thereby the ultimate strength of one's motivation and the direction of his behavior are:

1) the *expectations* or beliefs one has regarding the nature and likelihood of the consequences of his actions and

2) the value of these consequences to him in light of his particular personality and motives.

With this in mind, before going on, I'd like to point out that to say that women have a "motive to avoid success," i.e., a disposition or tendency to become anxious about "achieving" because they anticipate or expect negative consequences because of success, is not at all the same as saying that they have a "will to fail," i.e., a motive to approach failure. Unfortunately this has become an increasingly common misinterpretation of my conceptualization of the "motive to avoid success." The presence of a "will to fail" would imply that women actively seek out failure because they anticipate or expect positive consequences from failing. Quite to the contrary, it is precisely those women who most want to achieve and who are most capable of achieving who experience the detrimental effects of a "fear of success." Their positive achievement-directed tendencies are inhibited by the presence of the motive to avoid success because of the arousal of anxiety about the negative consequences they expect will follow success. Although there may well exist such a thing as a motive to

approach failure—a will to fail—it is not conceptually the same as the variable which I have called the "motive to avoid success," and should not be confused with it. Both theoretically and with regard to behavioral implications, the two are quite independent.

Unfortunately, in American society even today femininity and competitive achievement continue to be viewed as two desirable but mutually exclusive ends, just as they were in 1949 when Margaret Mead pointed out that "each step forward as a successful American, regardless of sex, means a step back as a woman." Thus the active pursuit of success is hindered and the actual level of performance attained by many otherwise achievement-motivated and able young women does not reflect their true abilities. When success is likely or possible, these young women, threatened by the negative consequences they expect to follow success, become anxious, and their positive achievement strivings become thwarted.

Thus their abilities, interests, and intellectual potential remain inhibited and unfulfilled. But at what cost? A recent analysis of some of our data shows that this unfulfillment does not occur without a price, a price paid in feelings of frustration, hostility, aggression, bitterness, and confusion, which are clearly manifested in the fantasy productions of these young women. A comparison of the thematic apperceptive stories written by young college women differing in strength of the "motive to avoid success" in response to the cue, "Anne is sitting in a chair with a smile on her face," helps make this quite evident. Whereas more than 90 per cent of those low in fear of success wrote positive, primarily affiliative stories centering on such things as dates, engagements, forthcoming marriages as well as a few on successful achievements, fewer than 20 per cent of those high in fear of success wrote stories of this type. The rest of the responses, if not bizarre, were replete with negative affiliative imagery centering on hostility toward or manipulation of others.

I think the stories speak for themselves; let me give you a few examples. Here are stories by girls low in fear of success.

> Anne's boyfriend has just called her. Not really boyfriend—a boy she really has wanted to go out with for ages. Anne is a very good looking girl—but never thought Mr. X would ever call her. She sees Mr. X in classes and she really thinks he is fine. She's really wanted to have a date with him for over one year now—and her day has finally come. Oh boy! I'm so excited what shall I wear? I wonder if I should buy something new to wear. Will he like me! I am so excited. Anne is very happy. Anne will have a marvelous time on her date and hope and pray that Mr. X will take her out again.

> Anne is happy—she's happy with the world because it is so beautiful. It's snowing, and nice outside—she's happy to be

alive and this gives her a good warm feeling. Anne did well on one of her tests, likes most of her classes in college. She hopes that if she has done well in the past she will continue to in her class. She wants to go into a subject she can do well in, she wants to major in a field she's good in and likes. She doesn't want to be a flunkie. She'll go into her field, if not this one, another one which she will take next year. If everything works out, she'll be happy. She can then repay her parents for everything they've done.

Anne is alone in her room. It's a beautiful day and there is a lovely hillside out the window. She is daydreaming. Her two closest friends have just met marvelous people and believe they are in love. Other nice things have happened to them. Anne has had a bad semester, low grades, her boyfriend broke up with her, her grandmother died. But in spite of everything the beautiful day and her friends' happiness create an aura of happiness about her. She is happy to know that they at least have the things they want. Their smiles sometimes mean more than her own. Anne will be unhappy for a while, but eventually her good nature and hopeful perspective bring her happiness too.

Anne is sitting in a chair. She is very happy. Her mother walks into the room, and Anne tells her mother that her boyfriend has called. They become engaged, set their wedding date.

Compare these with typical stories written by girls high in fear of success:

Anne is recollecting her conquest of the day. She has just stolen her ex-friend's boyfriend away, right before the high school senior prom. Anne was jealous of her friend's popularity and when they decided not to associate with each other, Anne decided to do something to really get back at her friend—take her boyfriend. Anne is thinking that she has proven herself equal to her friend socially. She wanted to hurt her and succeeded by taking the boyfriend away. Anne will lose him because he'll find out how sneaky and underhanded she is. They will go to the prom but it will end there.

Anne is newly married and she and her husband are visiting friends married for a long time, also having toddlers. The children have been shy with the strangers, but eventually seemed to warm up. The little girl will approach Anne's husband, but not Anne. Anne would like the little girl to be

her friend and approach her. The little girl will get over her shyness, and even allow Anne's demonstrations of "love." But she still prefers the quieter husband, and announces this fact.

Anne is waiting for the cab to come to take her to the Markley mixer where she wants to meet new people. She is thinking of the fun she'll have and thinking of encountering her ex-boyfriend who is president of the mixer. She had really liked her ex-boyfriend and since they broke up she really wanted to show him she can meet new boys and have fun with others besides him. She will meet another boy at the dance who showers her with his attention and she willingly and happily flaunts this boy in front of her ex-boyfriend. The new boy calls her later but she finds she doesn't really like him and only used him to show her ex-boyfriend.

Anne is at her father's funeral. There are over 200 people there. She sits in the front row of the alcove reserved for the family. Her mother, her brothers, and several relatives are there. Anne's father committed suicide. He was an irreligious man so the minister's sermon strikes Anne as ludicrous. She knows it is unseemly to smile but she cannot help it. Anne is fighting to keep from laughing. Her brother Ralph pokes her in fury but she is uncontrollable. Her mother is sobbing and unaware of Anne's behavior. Anne rises dramatically and leaves the room, stopping first to pluck a carnation from the blanket of flowers on the coffin.

The difference in the two kinds of stories is, I think, very clear. One can only speculate about how much of what was expressed in fantasy is a true reflection of the actual behavior or intents of these young women, and if these responses do in fact accurately reflect their behavior, what the consequences of such behavior might be for them.

In the course of our work it has become increasingly clear that once aroused the motive to avoid success exerts a powerful impact on one's achievement strivings. In the initial study it was the only one of the four other psychological variables assessed–i.e., the motives to achieve, to avoid failure, to affiliate with others, and resultant achievement motive–which predicted female performance. The girls high in the motive to avoid success performed at a significantly lower level in a mixed-sex competitive achievement situation than they did subsequently in a strictly non-competitive but achievement-oriented situation, in which the only competition involved was with the task and one's internal standards of excellence.

Those low in the motive to avoid success on the other hand performed at higher level in the competitive condition, as did most of the men in the

study. The results of the study suggested very clearly that girls, especially those with a high motive to avoid success, would be least likely to develop their interests and explore their intellectual potential when competing against others, especially against men, because the expectancy of negative consequences associated with success would be greatest under such conditions. It should be pointed out that it was only after a measure of the individual differences in the strength of the motive to avoid success was developed and used in the analysis that the results for the women in this study became at all meaningful or clear.

For those who are not familiar with the way in which presence of the motive to avoid success is assessed, let me briefly summarize.

Individual differences in the strength of the motive to avoid success are determined by the presence of "fear of success imagery" in thematic stories written by subjects in response to a verbal lead connoting a high level of accomplishment, particularly in a mixed-sex competitive achievement situation. Thematic apperceptive imagery connoting "fear of success" is defined as that in which statements are made showing:

1) the present or anticipation of negative *consequences* or *affect* because of the success, including fear of being socially rejected, fear of losing one's friends or one's eligibility as a date or marriage partner, and fear of becoming isolated, lonely, or unhappy as a result of the success.

2) any direct or indirect expression of conflict about the success, such as doubting or wondering about one's femininity or normality, or feeling guilty and in despair about the success.

3) denial of effort or responsibility for attaining the success, sometimes using psychologically ingenious means to change the content of the cue or simply by saying, "It is impossible."

4) bizarre or inappropriate responses to the cue, frequently filled with hostility or confusion, as for instance in the story in which Anne is "attacked and maimed for life" for her accomplishment.

In the first study the verbal lead used to assess the presence of "fear of success" for women/men was:

"At the end of first term finals Anne/John finds herself/himself at the top of her/his medical school class."

In that study more than 65 per cent of the 90 female stories written, compared with fewer than 10 per cent of the 88 male stories written, contained imagery connoting fear of success. The significant sex differences observed in presence of fear of success imagery ($p < .0005$) have been maintained in all subsequent samples of white men and women studied. In the studies using black samples we have found a reversal in the presence of fear of success imagery, fear of success being more characteristic of the black man than of the black woman.

I have argued that the motive to avoid success is a *latent*, stable, personality disposition, acquired early in life in conjunction with sex, sex

role standards, and sexual identity. It was, therefore, important to determine when, for whom, at what age, and under what circumstances this disposition is aroused, which then serves to inhibit the achievement strivings of women. It is, of course, consistent with expectancy-value theory to argue that the motive to avoid success is more likely to be aroused in high-achievement-oriented, high-ability women than in low-achievement-oriented, low-ability women. After all, only for those women who desire and/or can realistically expect to achieve success does the expectancy of negative consequences because of success become meaningful.

These are important issues and therefore one of the major reasons for several of the subsequent studies that have been done was simply to observe the incidence of fear of success imagery in female subjects at different ages and at different educational, occupational, and ability levels. The incidence of the motive to avoid success has ranged from a low of 47 per cent in a 7th grade junior high school sample to a high of 86.6 per cent in two of the subsequent samples tested: first, a sample of current law school students, and second, a sample of secretaries, all of whom were very able high school graduates. In each of the college samples tested fear-of-success imagery has ranged from 60 per cent in a sample of college freshmen at a large midwestern university to 85 per cent in a sample of very high ability juniors at an outstanding eastern coed university where the emphasis on achievement is very high.

In several of these studies the content of the verbal lead used was altered so as to make the situation described more consistent and meaningful with respect to the age, educational level, and occupation of the subjects being tested. For instance, in the junior high and high school levels, the cue used was: "Sue has just found out that she has been made valedictorian of her class." For the secretaries in the sample the cue used was: "Mary's boss has been permanently transferred to the California branch of the company she works for. The board of directors has chosen Mary above many of its other junior executives to take over his highly valued position."

It is of interest to note that, regardless of the specific cue used, the responses of the older, more successful women—for instance, those among our sample of present law school students and graduates compared with those of our younger, more naive college and high school students—were characterized by a concern with and an awareness of some of the *reality*-based sources for the motive to avoid success and reflected the actual price one must pay for overcoming societal pressures and pursuing one's interests despite them. For example, in response to a cue about a successful female law partner came the following response from a young female attorney (a recent law school graduate):

> Unmarried, probably because most men can't handle the emotional threat posed by such a bright, aggressive girl. She's attractive, well-dressed but rather hard. Comes on too strong. Has developed a defensive attitude towards men and people in general because of having to defend her right to be a lawyer. She is of course very able.

The high, and if anything increasing, incidence of fear-of-success imagery found in our studies indicates the extent to which women have incorporated society's attitudes and then have tended to evaluate themselves in terms of these attitudes–attitudes which stress the idea that competition, success, competence, and intellectual achievement are basically inconsistent with femininity. The emphasis on the new freedom of women has not done away with this tendency, any more than have the vote, trousers, cigarettes, and even similar standards of sexual behavior. If anything, the attitudes seem to be intensifying. In *The Return of the Cave Women* Margaret Mead has pointed out that women are not using their personal potential in the general community even to the degree that society would presently allow. One might speculate about how much of this problem is attributed to the high incidence of the motive to avoid success that we have observed. Mounting evidence in our data suggests that many achievement-oriented American women, especially those high in the motive to avoid success, when faced with the conflict between their feminine image and the development of their abilities and interests, compromise by disguising their ability and abdicating from competition in the outside world–just like Sally in the Peanuts cartoon who at the tender age of five says: "I never said I wanted to *be* someone. All I want to do when I grow up is be a good wife and mother. So . . . why should I have to go to kindergarten?"

Convinced that it is more important to *be* a woman, i.e., to live through and for others, than to become some kind of specialist, most young girls, especially in college, are prepared unconsciously if not consciously to surrender chances for personal distinction so as to be fairly sure of pleasing a larger range of men. These attitudes are reflected in the high incidence of the motive to avoid success and ultimately in the significant and *increasing* absence of capable and trained American women from the mainstream of thought and achievement in the society. This withdrawal exists despite the removal of many previous legal and educational barriers and despite the presence of more opportunities for women.

In light of the terrible loss of human potential and economic resources reflected by this pattern of behavior, it seemed particularly important for us to look more intensely and critically at the factors which tend to arouse the motive to avoid success and those most effective in minimizing its

influence. We therefore undertook two studies* at an outstanding eastern college for women, a school at which the students are chosen primarily because of their high ability, achievement, motivation, and previous success. Most of the students arrive at the school very ambitious and committed to the idea of distinguishing themselves in a future career, even if they are not exactly sure what it will be. But, as we will see from the data, by the time they are juniors, most have changed their plans toward a less ambitious, more traditionally feminine direction. Sandra Tangri, in 1969, found such a trend in her University of Michigan coeds.

The incidence of fear of success was 75 per cent in the first pilot sample tested, and 85 per cent in the second sample. Because of the early closing of the University last spring, the experimental portion of the second study is just now being completed. Thus only the admittedly limited, nonetheless interesting, data of the pilot study have been analyzed and will be discussed here.

Using a questionnaire and intensive interviews we tried to explore the elements present during the college experience, both personal and situational, which arouse the motive to avoid success. Particular attention was paid to how this motive influences the educational and career aspirations of these very bright and highly-motivated young women at a time in our society when self-actualization and equality of women are drawing much public attention. All the girls in the sample were doing well and had grade points of B– or better. Nevertheless, 12 of the 16, or 75 per cent, of these girls showed evidence of high fear of success. They manifested their anxiety about success in such reported behaviors as:

1) refusing to divulge the fact that they are doing well or have received an A, preferring instead to make their failures known. The more successful they were, the less likely they were to want to say so. For instance, all three of the girls who had straight A averages would prefer to tell a boy that they had gotten a C rather than an A. Most of the girls with B-'s preferred to report A's.

2) changing their majors and future career plans toward what *each of them considers to be for her (and this is important) a more traditional, appropriately feminine, and less ambitious one.*

Just how important it is to attend to each individual's subjective expectations and evaluation of certain careers was clearly emphasized by the subject who changed her career goal from medicine to law because she thought: "Law school is less ambitious, it doesn't take as long . . . is more flexible in terms of marriage and children. It is *less masculine* in that it is more accepted now for girls to go to law school."

The others who changed their aspirations from law school to

*The data in the first study were gathered and initially analyzed by Molly Schwenn for her junior honors project.

"teaching" or "housewife" apparently do not hold the same expectations about a law career.

Several of the girls indicate that they have given up the idea of a career at all and a couple even plan to quit school. Only two, or about 12 per cent, of the sample have in the course of their education in fact changed their plans toward a more ambitious, more traditionally masculine direction. Although several of the girls had started out majoring in the natural sciences, with the intent of pursuing a medical career, all are now, as juniors, majoring in appropriately female areas such as English, fine arts, French, and history. This pattern reflects what I have at other times indicated: namely, that no one feels badly about nor seriously objects to higher education in a woman, provided the objective is to make her a more interesting and enlightened companion, wife, and/or mother. The objections, the negative consequences, arise only when the objectives become more personal and career-oriented, especially in non-traditional areas.

Individual differences in the motive to avoid success were very effective in predicting these patterns of behavior. Whereas more than 90 per cent of those who showed evidence of high fear of success (11 out of 12) changed their aspirations toward a more traditional direction, less than 25 per cent of those low in fear of success did so.

A similar relationship is observed between individual differences in the motive to avoid success and responses to the question, "Are you more likely to tell your boyfriend or boys in your classes that you have gotten an A or a C?" Whereas 100 per cent of those low in fear of success would be more likely to report an A, sometimes with some explanation, only 33 per cent of those high in fear of success would do so.

Two of the factors considered as potentially the ones arousing the fear of success and thus negatively influencing the achievement strivings of these girls were the parental attitudes and those of the male peers toward appropriate sex role behavior. Many of the girls substantiated Komarovsky's argument that in the later college years girls experience a sudden reversal in what parents applaud for them. Whereas they have previously been applauded for academic success, these girls now find themselves being evaluated "in terms of some abstract standard of femininity with an emphasis on marriage as the appropriate goal for girls of this age." One says: "There is a lot of pressure from my mother to get married and not have a career. This *is one reason I am going to have a career* and wait to get married .... There is also some pressure from my father to get married, too."

There was, apparently, no relationship between such shifts in parental attitudes and fear of success. Nor did there appear, as you can see from that statement, to be any direct indication that parents had influenced anyone to turn away from a role-innovative type of career. If anything the influence appears to be in the opposite direction, as in the above example.

Some girls report being motivated for careers by the negative examples set by their mothers.

"My mother is now working as a secretary, but she didn't work until now. I don't want to end up like that."

"Another reason (I am going to have a career and wait to get married) is a reaction to my mother's empty life."

On the other hand, the attitude of male peers toward the appropriate role of women, which they apparently do not hesitate to express, appears to be the most significant factor in arousing the motive to avoid success in these girls. The girls who showed evidence of anxiety about success and social rejection and had altered their career aspirations toward a more traditional direction were either not dating at all (interestingly enough, it was the three girls with the all-A averages who were not dating at all) or were dating men who do not approve of "career women." When asked, for instance, how the boys in their lives feel about their aspirations, even the less ambitious goals, a frequent response–in fact, the most common response–was: "They laugh." Others were:

"He thinks it's ridiculous for me to go to graduate school or law school."

"He says I can be happy as a housewife and I just need to get a liberal arts education."

"He wants a wife who will be a mother full time until the kids are grown."

"I am turning more and more to the traditional role because of the attitudes of my boyfriend and his roommates. I am concerned about what they think."

This last comment is consistent with the idea that women are dependent on others for their self-esteem and have difficulty believing they can function well autonomously. This is again reflected in a statement made by one of the girls high in fear of success who is planning to leave college:

"I have a lot of ideas about what I'd like to do (water sculpture presently) but I'm waiting around for a man, and that makes me mad. I think that when I find someone I will be able to get involved in something. I need someone to respect me and what I want to do, to lend importance to what I sense is important."

The girls on the other hand who were either low in fear of success, or high in fear of success but continuing to strive for innovative careers, were either engaged to or seriously dating men who were not threatened by this success and in fact expected it of them, and provided much encouragement for them. This was reflected in such statements as:

"He wants me to be intelligent. It is a source of pride to him that I do so well."

"I would have to explain myself if I got a C. I want him to think I'm as bright as he is."

"*He* thinks it would be a good idea for me to go to law school."

"*He* feels very strongly that I should go to graduate school to get a master's degree. He does not want to feel that he has denied me a complete education."

It is interesting to note that one of the factors distinguishing the couples in this second group from those in the first is a mutual understanding that the boy is the more intelligent of the two. "He's so much smarter . . . competition with him would be hopeless." This fact or belief seems to be sufficient to keep the motive from being aroused and affecting behavior.

In the first group there exists a tension between the two, rooted in the fear that *she* is the more intelligent one. Other important factors seem to be based on how threatening the boyfriend sees her present and future success to be to *his,* i.e. are they in the same school, taking the same courses, planning to go to the same graduate school or to have the same career? "He is going to medical school, too, and we take some of the same courses. I don't compete with him, but he competes with me. I usually do better than he does and this depresses him. He resents the fact that I do better."

Clearly the problems of achievement motivation in women are more complex than simply the matter of having a more or less traditional view of the female role. A complex relationship appears to exist between the internal personality factors called *motives* and certain situational factors which determine the nature of the expectancy a girl has about the consequences of her actions and the value of these consequences to her in that situation. Does she, for instance, care about the boy?

Unlike the girls high in fear of success, who would give up their plans rather than their boyfriends, some of the girls low in fear of success indicate just the opposite. For instance:

"I am not going to let his thinking influence mine. I wouldn't marry him if he were adamant about this (giving up my career plans)."

Such responses are, however, few and far between. The fact that succeeding at a feminine task, such as becoming engaged to someone, seems to have a positive effect on the achievement strivings of some women, provided the man is secure and not threatened by her success, is indicated by a statement made by one of the girls high in fear of success, who showed an increase in her career aspirations following her engagement:

"In high school I was very uncomfortable about excelling. I had more of a feeling that there was something wrong with a girl succeeding. With my boyfriend, I'm much more secure."

We have only begun to appreciate the complexity of the issues involved, and in each new study as many new questions are raised as have been answered. It is clear from all we have said that despite the recent emphasis

on a new freedom for women, a psychological barrier continues to exist in otherwise achievement-motivated and able women to prevent them from exercising their rights and fulfilling their potential, even if they are aware that it is happening and are angry about it. It seems that, regardless of how many legal and educational barriers to achievement in women we remove, unless ways are found to prevent the motive to avoid success from being aroused, and to keep its influence at a minimum, our society will continue to suffer a great loss in both human and economic resources.

Differential Impact of College on Males and Females

D. Diane Hatch

I first became interested in the question, "Does college affect males and females differently?" when I started working with a study here at The University of Michigan. This study was an attempt to find out if an experimental college that had been set up here in 1967 was having any different kind or amount of impact upon its students than the regular Literature, Science, and the Arts program. When I first looked at the data, I realized that no one had examined them for sex differences. This was especially surprising to me because people who are involved in experimental education have traditionally had three major interests. These are: (1) personality characteristics and developmental stages; or (2) impacts of organizational social systems; or (3) the interaction between certain kinds of personalities and certain kinds of social systems. It seemed obvious to me that sex not only represents a major combination of personality variables, but it also involves different timing and even the sequence of developmental stages. Sex also happens to be a major role in almost every kind of social system.

I therefore decided to look at the available literature on past studies to see if sex differences had been found—both in students initially entering college and in the kind or amount of change males and females experience during college. Again, to my distress, I discovered that very little attention had been paid to sex differences in the past, at least as reported in the most famous reviews of the literature in this field or in the general findings of individual studies.

I will report the general findings I have attempted to gather regarding the differential impact of college on males and females from the research that has taken place over the last four decades in sex differences in the impact of college. However, I must first give you six good reasons as to why the whole area of studying the impact of college is difficult: (1) High school graduates decide for a variety of reasons whether they will go to college. (2) After having made the decision to go, they then select a particular college and that college must in turn select them. (3) Once in a college, individuals seek and are sought out by different environments within that college. These different environments are academic, physical, and interpersonal at the very least. All of these selection processes are probably sex-related or sex-linked in some way, but we know little about

the specific causes or results of such sex-linkage. The other three reasons are more methodological but equally important to note: (4) So many different methods and instruments have been used to study college impact that it is an almost impossible task to equate or compare results. (5) To try to measure change itself is methodologically messy and there is much current dispute in psychology about whether it is even possible. (6) There are almost no studies that have adequate control groups. This means, if we want to know if it is college that is having an effect on its students rather than maturity or developmental changes, we need to administer the same kinds of tests to the same-aged non-college population over the same four years. This kind of population is not only difficult to reach for testing purposes but they also have entered many other social systems of their own after graduating from high school.

Well, with that many disclaimers, let me proceed to the general conclusions I think I have found in past studies.

The first question is, "Does the entering college population reflect the general kinds of sex differences that we find in the American late-adolescent population as a whole?" The answer is "Yes." The entering college population is, in general, very like the total, late-adolescent American population. That is, we find the same sex differences in adolescents who enter college that we find in those who don't. Both sexes who enter college are higher in ability and socio-economic status than their non-college peers. However, high ability is a more important determinant of whether a male attends college than high socio-economic status. The reverse is true for females; that is, high socio-economic status plays the large part for females. Also, significantly fewer female high school graduates enter college than their male counterparts. Generally, both high school graduates and their parents consider going to college as more important for men than for women.

Probably most important of all initial sex differences is the fact that males entering college are oriented primarily toward a career and vocation. When asked what the important goals of a college education are, most males will rank vocational training first and obtaining a general education second. Females, on the other hand, are still very much oriented toward marriage and family, with some expecting to combine marriage with an additional career. However, even these "marriage and career" women tend to pick traditionally feminine careers—for example, teaching—which offer traditionally feminine satisfactions—that is, working with people *vs.* things. Therefore, even those women who intend to combine marriage with a career place more stress as they enter college on falling in love, getting married, having a good time socially, and being liked and accepted, than freshmen men do. They will also rank obtaining a general education as the most important goal of college. Likewise, fewer entering women than men intend to pursue a graduate education.

Entering college freshmen also reflect cultural stereotypic sex-role differences and interests. For example, males indicate relatively more interest in theoretical, political, and economic areas, while females are relatively more interested in religious, social, and aesthetic areas.

The rest of the findings I have to report fall conveniently into three major domains. These areas have been intensively studied in the "college-impact" research because they have been considered three different kinds of openness or ability to change, especially within a college setting. The sex differences that I will report here will not surprise you. They not only reflect general cultural sex-role expectations, but they also represent understandable and useful differences if you will keep in mind that males are primarily career-oriented and females are primarily marriage- and family-oriented. Also in the late-adolescent period, females gain much, if not most of their self-esteem from the opinions of others and from their sense of interpersonal competency. Males, on the other hand, gain self-esteem largely from task competency.

The first cluster represents a kind of intellectual openness to change. It consists of intellectual styles, different kinds of intellectual interests, and factors which correlate highly with academic achievement. In this area, females tend to report a higher motive for grades, greater participation in school-related activities, and more disciplined, obedient study during their high school years than men. Females also indicate more interest in reflective thought, ideas, aesthetic appreciation, and actual cultural sophistication than males. Entering women also generally show greater verbal interests and aptitudes. Males show greater quantitative interests and aptitudes. They also are more interested in abstractions, problem-solving, and practical areas.

The second cluster represents a kind of cognitive and attitudinal openness which has been called by some the "freedom to learn" syndrome. These attitudes and cognitive styles indicate a readiness to explore and to be involved with new ideas, new values, and new people, as well as the independence or autonomy to do so. In this area, females are generally less religiously liberal or open than males. However, they do tend to be more empathic than males toward people in general and especially to those who are different. Females will appear more "liberal" as a result when asked about social conscience or "welfare of all" issues. Males, on the other hand, tend to be more autonomous of the judgments of others and more independent in general—and specifically more independent of family as they enter college.

The third and final cluster is concerned with social and emotional characteristics. These characteristics are seen as relevant in this type of research either because they may be related to scholarly style and behavior or because they may limit a student's ability to adjust and to interact with college environments and demands. Men and women do not systematically

differ in their personal integration or mental health. They also do not differ in how dependent they are upon their peers. However, females are more sociable than males. Males, on the other hand, feel freer to think about, fantasize about, explore, and act out sexual aggressive impulses. They also tend to express less anxiety in general than females.

Now that we have examined initial sex differences, we can begin to look at the differential impact of college upon males and females.

In general, women do not change in what they consider to be the most important goals of an education. Nor do they change in the most important satisfactions they would look for in a job. Males do change in both these areas, however. The importance of obtaining a general education in college increases for males. The importance of an opportunity to use their abilities in a job increases, while the importance of job security itself decreases for males.

Educational aspirations increase more for men than for women. Eventually at least 20 to 30 per cent more senior men plan on attending graduate school than women. In addition, far more senior women than men who plan on graduate school, plan to postpone graduate school attendance until later than the following fall. Simultaneously, women in college become more marriage- and family-oriented, with a smaller percentage desiring to combine marriage with a career. Females tend to change majors more often than males do, and their career choices become increasingly "feminized" over their college years. Their interest in dating and friendships increases more than males; and their interest in grades and extracurricular activity decreases more than males'. Over four years of college, males generally become less "masculine" in stereotypic interests. Females become less "feminine" but less consistently or significantly so.

Returning now to the three major "openness to change," domains, let us summarize. Both sexes generally increase in their intellectual openness to change. Both sexes also increase in their attitudinal and cognitive "freedom to learn." In both these areas, a review of the data gives the impression that whichever sex enters higher on a particular scale or dimension also changes more on that dimension during college. Therefore, initial sex differences increase over four years of college. For example, females enter higher, change more, and leave even higher than males generally on scales measuring non-authoritarianism, non-ethnocentrism, cultural sophistication, etc. Males enter higher, change more, and leave even higher than females on religious liberalism, family independence, theoretical orientation, etc.

In the third major domain concerning social and emotional characteristics, *within* studies both sexes seem to be changing in the same direction and amount. There is one exception—males increase in peer independence over the college years and females decrease dramatically. Also both sexes seem to be increasing in the areas of autonomy, dom-

inance, confidence, and ability to express impulses, with females showing slightly more significant change than males. (Just for your information, approximately 60 per cent of the results concerning mental health and psychological well-being show both sexes improving, and 40 per cent show both sexes as decreasing over the college years. Approximately 50 per cent of the results show decreased sociability, extroversion, and friendliness and increased aggression for both sexes with another 30 per cent showing the opposite results and the rest showing very mixed findings.)

One important impact of college is dropping out. Although there is little agreement regarding relative dropout rates for women and men, there is some evidence that when input factors such as high school grades are controlled, more women than men drop out of college. There is, however, general agreement that men give more internal and academic reasons for withdrawal from college, whereas women tend to give external and non-academic reasons, especially marriage.

The one major national study I could locate which had change measures on both college persisters and same-aged non-college populations indicated that attendance at college (or perhaps nonattendance) had a much greater impact on change in women than in men over the four years studied. In most instances, women who persisted in college when compared with their same-aged, non-college peers changed more than the men did in "desirable directions,"—that is, increase in intellectual openness, in non-authoritarianism, in social maturity, in religious liberalism, in broadened and matured values, and in lack of anxiety. Women who stay in college change more dramatically than those women who are employed—who in turn change more than women who are homemakers. The results indicate that housewives generally mature less, decrease on intellectual modes and interests more, and increase in authoritarianism more than women who stay in college and employed women falling in between.

Now for my data (hot off the computer as it were) concerning the sex differences I have found thus far in the Class of 1971 sample at The University of Michigan, that is, students who will graduate next spring, or at least students who entered in the fall of 1967. In this population I found all of the initial sex differences reported before with two major exceptions: entering females were neither more sociable nor more non-authoritarian and liberal than entering males. There was also a slight tendency for females to show less emotional adjustment and personal integration than males.

Simple analyses of scores after one or two years showed decreased sex differences in all areas but two. Of the 30 scales and clusters I examined, initially there were 17 significant sex differences. Ten of these had disappeared upon retest, seven remained but were all less significant, and two new ones had appeared. (The seven significant sex differences that remained but were at a lower significance level were very stereotypic sex-

role related, e.g., cultural sophistication, esthetic interest, altruism, social conscience, impulse expression, theoretical orientation, and a stereotypic masculinity-femininity scale.) The two new significant sex differences were peer independence, with males increasing and females dramatically decreasing in this area; and sociability or social extroversion in which everyone was decreasing, but males more so than females. I also found the previously reported changes on the part of females to increase in marriage- and family-orientation and to choose more feminine careers over their first year of college.

I had originally hypothesized that females would change more than males in college and especially in the areas of attitudes and dependency. I thought I had five good reasons for this:

1) They would be more introspective in their thinking and more intellectually open.

2) They would be less authoritarian, so they would be more flexible in their approach to new ideas, attitudes, people, and experiences.

3) They would be more sociable and dependent, so they would be more open to influence from others.

4) They would have less-formed identities, which would lead to more exploration, experimentation, and change, and

5) They would be less career-oriented and so would be freer to treat college as an arena for exploring and experiencing the variety offered there. In other words, they would not be as confined to strictly task- and career-preparation as males are.

The first three reasons should be familiar to you by now as they represent the three major "openness or ability to change" domains and the sex differences usually found in them. However, only the last two more developmental and motivational sex differences (of the five I had counted on) proved to exist initially in the population here. There was considerable evidence that females attached more importance than males to self-discovery and to a wide variety of new experiences and people in college. They also were clearly less oriented toward preparing for a career and occupation.

Initial analyses have indicated that the females did become more family-independent. At the same time they became considerably more peer-dependent. From the data, one cannot conclude that they were transferring dependency, but some theory might suggest this. Studies have shown that males also increase in family independence and decrease in peer independence, but at an earlier stage in adolescence.

Also, both sexes became less sociable or socially extroverted. An examination of the items on the scales in this area indicates that this decrease might be due to a larger desire to be involved with a few close friends than large group gatherings. Studies again have shown that males do not use friends in this kind of intimate self-exploring way until a later

stage of adolescence than women do. Therefore, this is at least one possible explanation for the greater change of males than females in this area. Also, the heavy coursework demands upon those who are primarily preparing themselves for a career may explain in part the greater decrease by males than females in social extroversion.

Finally, analyses of variance of change show that whenever sex-college interactions occurred, females tended to be changing similarly regardless of whether they were in the experimental college or the regular program. Males seemed to be the sex that was more influenced by its immediate college environment or different curriculum. This fact also may be an indication that females are at a developmental stage ready to change in attitudes and dependency regardless of their immediate environment. On the other hand, males may be paying more particular attention to the specific external stimuli around them. Females do change more than males in dependency areas regardless of the college they attend. And within each college, females generally change more on attitudes than males.

These preliminary rough data tempt me to suggest that perhaps, unlike the usual emphasis in the literature, the three "openness to change" personality and attitude dimensions do not best explain the change differences found in this study. Instead, sex differences in developmental stages and motivational differences between the sexes might better explain the different impact college has had on males and females thus far in this study.

Noon Round Table:
The Case of the Woman Graduate Student

The Woman Graduate Student in Sociology

Greer Litton Fox

The remarks that I want to make this afternoon are based on a study that I did two years ago with 25 graduate students in the Department of Sociology.

I think that it's helpful to see the career of the woman graduate student as a cumulated series of decisions made at various points throughout her career. The options for these decisions are basically three. She can decide to continue in the program, she can decide to transfer to another school, or she can decide to drop out entirely. If we look at graduate careers in this way, we can then start asking what factors are involved in leading women to make the decisions they make.

I found in my studies that many sets of factors were involved in the decisions that women make as to whether to continue, to transfer, or to drop out. I want to say right here that academic considerations are only a very small part of the total complex of factors entering into why women decide to continue or drop out of a program. But I want to concentrate on those academic considerations and see what sorts of handles we can get on the whole problem, at least as far as the University is concerned, in keeping women in or out of a program. I found essentially four factors that are related to academic considerations. One of these is performance; another is the interest level in the field of specialization the woman is in; two others are relationships with graduate student men and relationships with the faculty.

Let's start at the beginning. Performance among the women that I studied turned out not to be an important factor. None of the women left the program or transferred because of their academic performance. Most women are doing well.

Interest was the second thing. There are many factors which feed into whether your interest level is maintained in your field or not, but I'm not at all convinced that these sorts of things are sex-linked. So I'm not sure we need to spend much of our energy and time on questions of interest.

So that brings us to the relationships with men students and the relationships with faculty. Although there are very many positive aspects to these relationships today, I want to concentrate on the negative aspects of these relationships. I'm doing this not only because it's relevant but be-

cause some men are interested in what they *can* do, or what they *are* doing, or why they are "male chauvinistic pigs." I want to suggest some of the things that make being a graduate student woman a rough career.

The first thing that male students do is to suspect the intentions of women. The suspicion is generally that women come to graduate school to look for a man, not for a degree. This suspicion is manifested very subtly. It's not always expressed and it's very rarely explicit. But it is there and it creates a tension between men and women students, particularly single students. This feeds into the loneliness that many women graduate students feel. Loneliness turns out to be a very real problem for graduate student women.

A second thing that graduate men do to graduate women can be very succinctly stated. It is that they do not take graduate student women seriously. Rather, women are seen to be in graduate school as a sideline, as something extra. Graduate students often have gripe sessions. I was a frequent participant in these and a vocal participant. But over and over again the question that was put to me was, "You know, Greer, why are you going through this? You really don't have to be here, you don't have to put up with this. Why are you here?" There seemed to be no realization of the idea that I was there for the very same reasons that they were there. I was there for professional training. Men expressed two views to me and to other women in my study. One was that women have the option of leaving at any time they want to women don't *have* to be in graduate school. The second view was that I was weird—I was a fool for being there when I didn't have to be.

I want to get into the subtle disadvantage that this leads into for women. The disadvantage is that there is no positive support for women built into the system. A frequent complaint of the women I talked to was that no one goes out of his way to encourage a woman student. Instead, it's seen as unusual if a woman continues in a program and goes on for a Ph.D. Furthermore it's seen as no tragedy, no loss, if she does drop out. This lack of positive support can undercut any sort of self-generated drive that a woman may have. Women can drop out without losing the face that men do. As one of the students put it, "You know, there's no pressure on me to be a good sociologist; the only pressure on me is to make a good marriage and raise properly socialized children." This translates into the fact that we let women fall by the wayside. We let them drop out of school without seeing this as a tragedy, without seeing it as a loss. Instead we see it as the normal run of things. It's unusual and extraordinary for a woman to be in graduate school. But we need, and men need, to see it as the normal thing, as nothing out of the ordinary. It shouldn't take any special effort or special energy to be in graduate school and to stay there.

Now I want to discuss two points about graduate students' relationship with the faculty. One point is the lack of positive support, but there's

another thing. The traditional faculty attitude toward women students—and I'm probably going to overstate the case—is based on the assumption that women students won't finish. And if they do finish, they won't be in the national marketplace as professionals; they won't be publishing or making contributions as professionals. And if they do publish, if they do try to make contributions, they won't be any good at it. And if by chance they are good, then they're abnormal—they're superwomen—they're Amazons. And you get into the really ugly thing about penis envy, things that are really derogatory toward women.

Let's focus on the one thing that perhaps we can deal with in our university or departmental setting, the attitude among faculty that graduate student women won't finish. Now this attitude is okay if men want to have it. The point where we ought to focus is the point at which this attitude becomes institutionalized in departmental policies, policies that are involved in recruitment and in admissions, discriminatory policies for admitting or hiring a man rather than a woman, even if they're both equally qualified, policies on funding—who gets the money. If there's a limited supply of money, it typically goes to the male. There is the refusal to think about special programs for special cases—maternity leave for pregnant women, things of this sort. These institutionalized policies generate the very results—that is, women dropping out early, women taking a longer time to finish—that departments are using to justify their policies. So we get a vicious circle that keeps going on and on. What we need to do is break into that circle, at some point.

I really think that enlightened leadership at the departmental level could handle this. Part-time schooling could be made more possible. Child-care centers could be made available. There could be special funding for special cases, things of this sort. This is something that we can really do or that men in departmental leadership positions can do.

The second thing that I wanted to talk about in faculty relationships with graduate students is something that I think we don't deal with, and it may be because it's a taboo topic. But I want you to focus in on the type of one-to-one relationship that faculty members have with graduate student women, or can have, in the sense of advising relationships, lab-assistant relationships, research-assistant relationships. This one-to-one setup is a perfect setting for seduction, and I don't necessarily mean sexual seduction. It can be intellectual too. It can also be a two-way street; not only can professors seduce their women students, but women students can seduce their professors. On an intellectual level it may turn out that a professor is teaching or playing up to one student in the class. I bring this up for two reasons. One is that I think it's very often a problem both for graduate student women and for faculty members, and the second reason is that I think it goes unrecognized. It's a frequent problem, but we don't see it as such, and I think it may help a lot of us to recognize what's going

on. I think there is a sexual ambiguity in the relationships between men and women that at some point has to be resolved before they can go on to a working relationship. The resolution may be very subtle, it may be instantaneous. It's rarely voiced and I think when it is brought up, it is frequently denied. But I do want to throw this out as a possible source of discussion later. Maybe we'd better start looking hard at just what we're talking about when we're talking about some of the things that graduate student women are into.

039

Women Graduate Students in Political Science

Sybil L. Stokes

I want to speak with considerable optimism about the outlook for women graduate students, specifically those seeking doctorates in the social sciences. Because the majority of men and women who earn Ph.D.'s go into academic employment—and this is even more true of women than of men—my optimism is bound up with some changes in the academic marketplace, where women, as we are all aware, are more conspicuous at the lower than at the higher levels of employment. The discipline I am most familiar with is political science and while my "hard data," such as they are, come from that field, I know that some of the changes taking place in that discipline are happening in other social sciences as well.

Let me review first the findings about graduate women that seem to me to give some hope for a greater number of women Ph.D.'s in the future. A year ago Mary Fitts and I completed a study of the records of graduate students in the Political Science Department at Michigan over the past 15 years and noted some facts about women. Over the 15-year period about a quarter of the graduate students had been women (a figure perhaps a little higher than generally true nationally during the period), but the proportion of Ph.D.'s awarded to women was only 6 per cent (a figure quite consistent with the national average in political science at the time).

Why so very few women Ph.D.'s? Our data, based simply on the academic records of students, shed no light on the motivations of students or the human drama, so to speak, that leads to decisions about education and careers. But we are able to look at one of the myths that has long pervaded the academic world -and in particular those distributing financial aid—the idea that women are poorer risks, that they are less likely to finish their degrees than men are. It is hard to imagine a clearer example of the self-fulfilling prophecy: women are seen as having higher attrition rates, thus are denied scholarships, thus drop out of school. What seemed to us remarkable, considering the obstacles in the way of women, is how little difference there has been between men and women in their success in earning degrees. Our data show that 59 per cent of women who entered graduate studies with a B.A. succeeded in earning an M.A., compared with 53 per cent of men in the same category. And of those who came with an M.A. or remained at Michigan after earning the M.A., 44 per cent of

women earned a Ph.D. here, compared with 56 per cent of men. Obviously women are as capable of earning advanced degrees as men. The very, very small number of women who earned Ph.D.'s is not the result of higher rates of attrition among women who start out in a Ph.D. program, but from the very, very small number of women who started out to earn a Ph.D. Most women over this 15-year period—nearly nine out of ten—did not go beyond the master's degree. This, of course, was not true only of Michigan and political science. As recently as 1964 a study of women enrolled in graduate schools showed more than 70 per cent seeking an M.A., with only 20 per cent looking toward a Ph.D.

If we are looking toward a fuller sharing of women in the academic world—and this means a greater parity among men and women holding doctoral degrees—our data on the women who were currently enrolled in the Political Science Department when we made our study (1968-9) offer some encouragement. The proportion of women is still very small (in fact, smaller than in the past), but while nine of ten women in the past were master's degree candidates, of the current women students nearly half held a master's degree already and were going on to seek a Ph.D. Thus the number of women earning Ph.D.'s in political science at Michigan should increase rapidly in the next few years.

As I have said our small study sheds little light on why women did not seek Ph.D.'s and does not help much in explaining what has changed. An NIH study of women and their problems in pursuing graduate study shows 42 per cent of women listing financial obstacles, 41 per cent family responsibilities, 16 per cent lack of available graduate school, 13 per cent lack of proper qualifications, and so on down to 3 per cent, who cited disapproval of husband. Perhaps the better economic times we have enjoyed until recently lessened the financial obstacles for some women so that they could see their way toward the longer process of earning a Ph.D., rather than stopping at the master's degree. Perhaps we are seeing the result of the changed status of the master's degree itself, for men as well as women.

Whatever the reasons for these small but encouraging signs of change within the graduate student setting, many things are happening within the professional disciplines that surely will accelerate the movement for parity for women. In political science, for example, a Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession has done much to publicize the really shameful figures (equally shameful in the other social sciences, I should add) about women's rank in departments. A Women's Caucus for Political Science has been urging changes in policies that have been detrimental to women's achievement—anti-nepotism rules, penalties for part-time employees, hiring and promotion policies. As these changes come about and women become more visible in the academic world, the existence of successful women teachers in universities—serving as models for undergraduates as well as

graduate students–will do a great deal to encourage women to overcome the still considerable obstacles to earning Ph.D.'s.

Discrimination and the Woman Law Student

Noel Anketell Kramer

I think you may be surprised that I overlap so much with Greer but I don't really see any problem with this. I think that perhaps it will emphasize to you that two people looking at two completely different graduate fields can come up with approximately the same results. I'm afraid that I can't be quite as optimistic as Sybil about the improvement of the woman law student. Perhaps this is because law is thought to be a field traditionally dominated by men and because so few women as yet are in it.

For example, at The University of Michigan women constitute only approximately 7 per cent of the law school enrollment. Even worse, in the professional world women comprise only about three per cent of practicing lawyers. I thought that today I would try to trace the experiences which women law students go through in graduate school, based upon my personal observation, and then I'll touch briefly on what they can expect when they graduate.

The woman law student usually enters law school with the naive idea that she has a perfect right to be there. After all, it is the extension of many years. She is likely to believe that she has a duty to herself and to society to use the intelligence she has. The few comments she heard before coming to law school–such as "Don't educate yourself out of the marriage market," or "Women can't make it in a man's field," she dismissed as the opinions of ignorant people. She believes that hard work in law school will conquer what obstacles exist, and that her abilities will be recognized.

At first the woman law student has the pleasant experience of receiving much attention from male law students. She soon learns, however, that this attention is really inspection. If they find her unattractive–and I am not referring to personality traits–she is seen as inflicting herself upon them. If attractive, it is assumed she came to law school for one reason alone–to capture some poor innocent for a husband. Perhaps because of fear of success in this devious marriage plan, or perhaps because of the common male fear of the intellectually equal female, most women, including those swamped with male attention before coming to law school, find the social life in law school to be abominable.

One of the most annoying aspects of law school is that many of the

males refuse to recognize that you are there for the same reasons that they are: prestige, power, money, or even personal satisfaction. Despite your assertions of serious intent, the assumption is that once you get married and have children, you will change your mind. After hearing time and again, "And why are you in law school?" or "You don't plan to practice law, do you?" (this, by the way, said by a first-year male law student to a third-year woman law student), patience begins to wear a little thin.

The woman law student is caught on the horns of a dilemma. If she is quiet and does not assert herself in class, she is called passive, and this supposedly proves she will never make a really good lawyer. On the other hand, those of us who are more assertive are labelled aggressive, castrating females who will do anything to get ahead. Somewhere in this process the woman law student begins to question her femininity, and to wonder if perhaps there is not indeed something wrong with her.

One result may be that she changes her aspirations to the areas of law where women have been traditionally accepted: juvenile law, divorce law, or trusts and estates. Another possible result is that she keeps her original goals but becomes extremely defensive and resentful.

In the second year the woman law student starts interviewing for a summer legal job. Although warned of discrimination in hiring, most women law students initially do not believe that it exists. After all, they suffered through the first year just as have the men. Besides, all know that in America hard work brings rewards. I want to give you a few well-documented comments from the interviewing process which makes the law school experience a bit unpleasant.

One girl received a letter from a law firm praising her academic record, but saying that she could not be hired because of her "sex handicap." Another girl was told by an interviewer that the only way to obtain a position with his firm was to be willing to enter their trusts and estates department—a place where women lawyers have often been shunted. A third girl was told by an interviewer, who leaned over the corner of the desk and looked downward, "The only problem with you, Miss Jones, is that you're wearing a skirt."

These instances are not isolated. Many law firms do not wish to hire women as fully participating lawyers. The major reasons given are that women are more emotional, that they get married and leave, that they get pregnant and leave, and that clients do not like them. Statistics, of course, are of little help in convincing law firms to hire women. Although it has been shown in Professor James White's article on "Women and the Law"* that the turnover rate of men and women is not significantly different, law firms simply do not believe this. They are convinced that once a woman has children, she will disappear forever into the oblivion of housewifery. As for the problem of clients not wishing to deal with women, this asser-

*White, James, "Women and the Law," *Michigan Law Review*, 1965.

tion is made by the firms which will not hire women or allow them to deal with clients. Firms with fully participating women will deny the existence of this client prejudice.

High qualifications, too, are not necessarily the solution for a woman, although they certainly will help. This fact was brought to my attention in a recent interview when I asked how difficult it was for a woman to be given responsibility in the firm. "Not at all difficult," answered the interviewer. "Why, we have an excellent woman, with us for 30 years, who is in charge of all our blue sky securities work." "Marvelous," I said. "Is she a partner?" He hesitated, then said "Well, no—but she's about to retire, so we're thinking of making her one." A further discouraging fact, documented by the White study, is that after ten years of legal practice, women are earning only half as much as men.

Despite the dreary picture that I have drawn, I have yet to be convinced that women should not be fully participating members of the legal profession. This year the women law students are working to recruit more women into law school on the theory that once we constitute a good proportion of the law school, it will be harder for law firms to ignore us. In addition, we are asking the University to enforce its policy against allowing employers who discriminate on the basis of sex to use the University's placement services. Last year the faculty voted to ban the law firm of Royall, Koegel and Wells from using the placement services for one year because the interviewer made remarks indicating that he would discriminate against women in hiring. I should point out that Michigan is certainly in the forefront in doing this, because to my knowledge no other schools have ever banned a law firm for discriminating against women in hiring. In addition we are attempting to change the mind of employers by presenting the problem to them at an alumni meeting this October. We can only hope that ten years from now the situation in the legal field will have changed significantly, but I must say that before it can change, a number of old ideas must be banished.

The Black Woman Graduate Student

Grace E. Mack

I think one of the first things we have to realize is that black people face a very severe challenge in the 1970's. What I'd like to address myself to today is the fact that black females particularly are faced with a challenge in the '70's. But I'd like to make one thing clear before I begin. The kinds of experiences that are likely to be encountered by black females who are continuing their education at The University of Michigan are experiences that if you look at it in terms of priorities–cannot be classified into male and female. The experiences that are likely to have the most profound impact on the education of black women are those experiences encountered by all black students whether they are male or female.

Let me talk a little bit about the kinds of experiences black students do encounter here at The University of Michigan, and about where I think the source of the problem lies. I didn't say problems encountered by black students–I said experiences encountered by black students–because the experiences that are encountered by black students at this University are an outgrowth of the white problem at this University and are not a black problem.

The experiences encountered by black students here at The University of Michigan are, in my opinion, an outgrowth of the following practices and attitudes:

1) White racism, whether it be overt or covert.

2) Egocentrism of whites as to what constitutes a "good education."

3) The refusal of the University to accept responsibility to provide individuals with skills relevant to solving the pressing social problems of the day.

4) Attempts to appease and coöpt black students into believing that the University is attempting to address itself to the problems of blacks and other minorities.

5) The blatant attitude that this is a white university and not a state university.

6) The systematized effort to have black students compromise their priorities for the sake of a "lily-white" education.

7) The pursuit of knowledge at this University for knowledge's sake, and not for any practical or pragmatic reason.

The above are but a few of the attitudes and practices that black students are confronted with and have to deal with when they are a part of

this system that we call The University of Michigan. Anyone would admit that for blacks to deal realistically with any of the above is a hell of a challenge, but these are things that black students, whether male or female, find it necessary to deal with in an effort to humanize the University for blacks as well as for whites.

The black graduate student, male or female, coming into higher education has one superordinate goal: to participate meaningfully in the liberation struggle of blacks in this country and ultimately in the world. With that goal in mind black students are in The University of Michigan for two reasons:

1) To pursue their destiny as individuals, and

2) To gain a skill that will contribute in some meaningful way to the solution of the problems facing the larger black community.

Consequently, what is happening is that black graduate students, and especially those at The University of Michigan, are building their own support systems that will contribute to the liberation of black people by seeking out areas in graduate and professional schools that are relevant to the immediate and future survival needs of the black community.

So with that assumption about black graduate students here at the University, it is no wonder that in every discipline you see popping up organized black caucuses that are ready to deal with this system in the University, to make it more responsive to the needs of black people. Just to mention a few: the Black Students' Psychological Association, the Black Social Work Students, and the Black Law Students' Alliance.

The problems that these organizations are dealing with is really testimony to the new commitment of black students that I mentioned earlier. For example, student recruitment, faculty recruitment (that is, black student recruitment, black faculty recruitment), curriculum development and innovation, community action, supportive services for black undergraduates, scientific and ethical responsibility in research on black people, Afro-American and African studies: these are among the problems being addressed by these various organizations.

Black students here have been able to identify problem areas, to suggest mechanisms for change and to carry out plans of action. For example, the Coalition for the Utilization of Learning Skills, made up largely of black male and female graduate students, developed a very creative tool for dealing with the problems of supportive services for black undergraduates. This didn't come from the white faculty. This came from black male and female graduate students who saw a need, identified the problem, suggested a plan for change, and put that plan into action. There are other instances that I could cite also, but if any of you are familiar with the strike that went on last year, conducted by the Black Action Movement, I'm sure you are well aware of what other black organizations as well as BAM have been doing on this campus.

Black students here at Michigan are totally committed as black people and are willing to put in the necessary time and energy to make this University more responsive to the needs of black people. And incidentally I might mention the very severe energy drain on the resources of the black student who is trying to get an advanced degree in this University. Besides classes, studying, research, there is this necessary involvement in "black work." Black students have to address themselves to the way the University treats black students on this campus. And when you have to go to three or four meetings a week dealing with the coalition or the center, and still maintain what is supposed to be a good academic record to make it through this University, I cannot begin to tell you what a serious drain it is on your sheer physical energy. And so don't anybody say anything about black students' motivation to learn or to do well or to succeed, because they are seeing this as a very relevant part of their education and are willing to have this energy drain and this physical drain so that in the future they will be able to address themselves to the survival needs of black community.

One might get the idea that blacks are not interested in education, research, or skill-building. Quite the contrary. Black students, both male and female, recognize and assume their responsibility to provide the necessary skills for the survival of the black community. It must be made clear, however, that black students here do not buy the idea that you must follow a certain yellow brick road to get to that alphabet soup at the end of your name. We also don't buy the fact that education is a one-way street. Nor do we buy the argument that everyone who enters the doors of the University enters into some sort of unwritten agreement to accept a predetermined and planned course his education is to follow. I think it is in this respect—that is, in not accepting education as it is presently constituted—that black students have a major contribution to make to the University. Several examples are in order.

What happens when black students ask for relevant courses? There is a dearth of black faculty, so who is to teach the courses? Black students get down to the business of organizing and developing their own courses and recruiting black faculty at the same time. If you just go down the roster of the Center for Afro-American studies you will find that a number of the courses taught in the center are courses organized by graduate students, and a number are being taught by black females.

Black students are helping to redefine the type of research projects that are considered to fulfill degree requirements. By structuring research so that it is more action-oriented and more problem-solving, research moves away from the idea that you just collect a body of research and let it sit on the shelf somewhere for the course duration. Blacks are questioning the white model of normalcy and adequacy, and are not accepting the notion that if you don't fit you're the deviant one. Blacks are beginning to look at

the sickness in the society and the pathology of the society and are recognizing its contributions or rather non-contributions to the survival of the black community. We are meeting this challenge and humanizing the University in the same process.

As black women we don't have the option to deal with what white females are discussing now in terms of women's liberation. I am not going to say that the women's liberation argument does not have some merit. We all know this thing about the roles females are supposed to play in society and the roles the males are supposed to play, but we really feel that for black females at this point to make their femaleness tantamount to their blackness would be an extremely diversionary tactic. We cannot forget, not one time, that we are black before we are female, because we are discriminated against mostly because we are black and not because we are women.

So I would like to reiterate then that the experiences of black students on this campus evolve from situations that affect them because of their race and not because of their sex. Black females and black males are meeting this challenge together and contributing their share to the struggle for black liberation. Black women have been the backbone of the black nation ever since slavery. We have assumed our responsibility as black people in the struggle for black liberation and we do not intend to forget what we are about.

A Graduate Student in Population Planning Looks at the Future for Women

Carolyn Houser

I've been working and studying in the field of population planning for the last five years, and am now one of the two women in the doctoral program. My experiences as one of 5,400,000 women who head their own families in the United States, and as a student in the School of Public Health have led me to re-think, in the past two years, everything I ever thought before about the roles of women. I have been fully persuaded by my population studies that we cannot afford to continue to raise women who seek their primary personal fulfillment through the experiences of motherhood. Someday population growth must stabilize, and we will have to face the necessity of rearing women who do *not* build their lives around their children but are equipped to find satisfaction in other sources of personal fulfillment. The University of Michigan has a vital role to play in facilitating this, and the graduate programs are precisely where the preparation of many women for this kind of life will take place.

I find myself a student mother in a University which apparently operates on the assumption that students have no families. The requirement that graduate students in my program work part-time in addition to their studies is a burden to me, though perhaps would not be to a male student. I spend 40 hours a week with my children and household work in addition to a full-time graduate schedule. I am expected to leave my children before they leave for school in order to attend an 8 a.m. class, and I've had many classes in the evening which began before their bedtime. I pay sitters for each of those classes and must arrange for nine hours a day of care all summer. In April I'll have to pay for 45 hours of sitting because the University of Michigan spring recess is a month prior to public school vacation. Just because I favor small families doesn't mean I don't want any family life. The University could do much more in policy changes and scheduling to make the combination of family responsibilities, work, and school a reasonable one.

The woman of the future will have her one or two children (and perhaps adopt a third) in her twenties. When they start school, she will be ready to begin or up-date her preparation for a career, usually in the paid

labor force. Her work-life expectancy, if she enters the labor force by age 35, will be at least 25 years, a substantially greater part of her life than the 10- or 15-year child-care and housewife period. She will have been raised to *expect* an active life of some kind and will have been planning toward it since high school alongside her male companions.

Since her focus will not be as strongly centered on the necessity of marriage, and her self-esteem will have been nourished to a greater degree than in our present society, she will be less likely to become pregnant at awkward times or to marry unsuitably or precipitously.

I can foresee some very reassuring social blessings gradually resulting from a rise in the status of women—not only a lessening of population pressures (as currently seen in our schools, cities, and pollution problems), but a healthy improvement in the relationships of people to one another. Women cross all boundaries: racial, national, political, economic, educational, and religious. The feminist movement toward greater self-esteem on the part of women is potentially a tremendously unifying force, and I expect it to have a world-wide impact. To cross this last and most deeply entrenched set of all human prejudices, is to cross the last and widest bridge dividing human beings one from another. I think it is no accident that the feminist movement has come to the fore now—in the midst of the unresolved problems of racism and war. We need a working model which solves that most ancient and basic problem in human relationships: how do people (or nations) that consider themselves equal, different, and sovereign, relate in a productive and reciprocal way without falling into patterns of coercion, paternalism, dominance, or submission? I want to suggest that the model for a solution to that problem could come from a new kind of partnership between men and women. Then we would be far better equipped to make progress in other fields—social psychology and government, for example. This University cannot safely pursue truth or produce programs for social progress in departments which see the world through the eyes of one sex alone.

Where do we stand today in preparing women for their post-childbirth years? Not very far along. The status of women compared to men has been declining in the U.S. for decades, according to Dean Knudsen, Professor of Sociology at Purdue University, whether measured by occupation, income, education, or political power. Proportionately fewer women hold professional and technical jobs now than women held in 1940. The 42 per cent gap between the average earnings of men and women working full-time is widening. The average white woman today earns less working full-time than the average black male. Black and white women with some college education earn less than the average black man with eight years of education. Women's proportion of Ph.D.'s, law degrees, and professional positions are less now than they were in 1930. Women are earning proportionately fewer master's degrees than they did 30 years ago and

have a smaller proportion of college-teaching positions. There are fewer women in government now than 10 years ago, both at the national and local level.

This University practices many kinds of discrimination disheartening to women graduate students. The most noticeable is the filling of office staff positions with women who have more education than necessary for clerical jobs. This means that women with high school educations who could do this work find no openings. It also means that the college-educated secretaries are used as a cheap source of skills which, if properly classified, would cost the University more. That is, they are used for writing, editing, and research-type work, but they are not paid professional rates for it. This depresses the market for professional women who are classified in these jobs but can't get properly paid for them either. All three groups are thus forced to underpay their babysitters and household help.

What do I find around me? Tremendously gifted women, often making straight A's, who doubt their own abilities. They cannot imagine themselves in positions of high responsibility. There is almost no one to look at. They do not reach out or set their sights high, even when they have all the training and talent needed. The University community must give them the kind of social support and institutional backing they need to step forward, not backward, into the next century.

Afternoon Discussion:
The University and Women – What Directions?

Reflections on the Future of Universities and of University Women

Charles Tilly

Right now some 5 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities. More than 2 million of them are women. By 1980 the numbers will very likely increase by half and could possibly double. A great deal of American manpower, and womanpower, is going into universities. And out of the colleges and universities is coming a great deal of complaint about the way America runs its business, including its educational business.

If I heard President Nixon's Kansas State speech right, he believes that nothing is fundamentally wrong with American universities, that channels for reforming what is wrong with them are quite open, and therefore that deliberate disruptions of university functioning are not only senseless but reprehensible. He tells us that most students, especially at Kansas State, are sensible. orderly, and presumably satisfied; protests, disruption, and violence, therefore, come from a lunatic fringe which must be checked in order to save the university.

But the fact that our greatest institutions invite a student to lead the way in protest, that calm is the condition of the mediocre, should make us all realize that we're dealing with more than a momentary aberration of a few unwashed longhairs. The great concentration of the new drive for women's rights on major college campuses provides more evidence of the sensitivity of academic communities to the principal problems and changes of American life. I don't want to insist on that point (despite my belief that it is correct), because I would have to compare the analysis of the response to the Vietnam war, to pollution, to changing American technology, and so on against the common accusation that colleges wrongheadedly isolate themselves from the mainstream of American life. Regardless of the accuracy of the analyses of American life as a whole which prevail on college campuses, the problems and complaints about the way the colleges themselves do their work are a sufficient sign of change and malaise within the institutions of higher learning.

I only want to make three broad assertions and leave them essentially unproved:

1) A large part of the difficulty comes from a transformation, which may in itself be very desirable: the enormous increase of the importance of

the university as a resource (or a concentration of resources) for the pursuit of a wide variety of activities–technological innovations, the training of technical personel, the certification of new members of the elite, and so on. But much of the structure has remained that of the smaller, elite institutions of before World War II.

2) Without fully realizing it, Americans are fighting over what services universities should provide and who should have a right to them. Should they be dispensing security for the children of families who have made it in American life? Social mobility for the children of families who have not? New weapons for the army? Pollution control devices for the automobile industry? Certificates of ability to survive routine and discipline to prospective employers? Political activists to the many movements waiting for their aid? Scientists to science? Calm and competence to mothers for the next generation of American children? Opportunities for liberation and exploration of self to the students waiting for admission? All of these outside constituencies, and more, are struggling for control of the resources of the University. Most schools have responded by doing a little of each. In principle, however, almost any one of these activities could consume the entire resources of a university. But demands of the outside world impose an unavoidable conflict on our academic communities. We only see one small tentacle of a huge undersea monster when a protest against the legitimacy of some particular kind of research on campus goes up, or when we begin to debate in general terms the "priorities" which ought to prevail.

3) Within colleges and universities themselves different groups are advocating and carrying on a wide variety of activities which may be compatible with each other in some ultimate sense, but which certainly conflict with each other frequently in day-to-day work. Some of them are trivial and some of them are illegitimate. But I think there are four major kinds of activity which are both legitimate and serious responsibilities of an intellectual community to itself and to the world–and yet which frequently get in each others' ways. I have in mind:

(a) the acquisition of systematic knowledge about the way the world works through scientific and critical use of the intellect;

(b) the search for concrete ways to apply that systematic knowledge to the benefit of mankind;

(c) the provision of a setting in which a wide variety of people can learn what they want to learn about the world and about themselves;

(d) the teaching of technical skills like those of medicine or engineering to new practitioners in those fields.

My feeling is that we have let the multiple activities (whose concatenation produced, I suppose, what Clark Kerr dubbed the "multiversity") jam each other so that we do not even perform the legitimate ones well. What is more, we have tried to force most of them into the image of elite

undergraduate education which prevailed before World War II. That leads us into silly adventures like packaging education degrees in four years of experience almost entirely set outside of school rooms, ending with the traumatic expulsion of the prospective teacher into a classroom where the newcomer finds much of the doctrine learned over the previous four years irrelevant, and little of the day-to-day supervision he now requires available. But I don't have time to go into our many foibles along those lines. I suspect that women suffer even more seriously from the incongruities of this situation than men do, because they are passing through a system so many of whose essentials came into being to help young men of good prospects and/or good families to pass into appropriate segments of the educated elite. Perhaps we can talk about that later.

What I have said so far indicates that proper reform of colleges and universities would involve changing the relationship between higher education and the rest of the world and even, to some degree, changing the rest of the world. I'm afraid I have to disappoint myself and you by concentrating here on changes which might occur within the university. But I'll try to break apart some of these major activities going on in universities right now—break them apart organizationally, not necessarily insulating them from each other or keeping the people who are doing them away from each other.

One way of doing this which occurs to me is to create four different organizations in the same general location. One would be a "science center" devoted essentially to research and only engaged in teaching to provide training and supervision to new researchers. The second would be an "action center" consisting of people specialized in the identification of problems which would yield to the application of systematic knowledge, the commissioning of research on those problems, and the bringing together of expertise to provide practical solutions. The third organization is a "critical university" open to the entire population and teaching the whole range of topics on which someone's desire to communicate and someone else's desire to learn can get it. Finally, we have the "technical university" taking responsibility for the preparation of professionals, but instead of insulating them for a few years from their profession before thrusting them upon an unsuspecting world, getting them into the field under supervision very soon and maintaining that supervision over many, many years.

The implication of such a scheme is to get rid of conventional undergraduate education as we now know it, to dispense with most degrees; only the technical university would really need to do much certification of its graduates. In fact, the other institutions would not have graduates in the present sense of the word. To bring all this off properly, we would want to change some of the things that now happen to people before they arrive at college. We would, for example, want to compress the typical

exposure to the common culture and to basic skills in literacy, mathematical analysis, and so on, that a student now gets during his first two years of college into an education he would then complete by age 16 or 17. I would like to see just about everyone complete that much general education.

At that point a break in formal schooling of two years or more would be exceedingly beneficial. We might promote and even subsidize a few years of adventure and wandering, of public service, and of the world of work. At any time after age 20 or so, and in any order, we could then imagine people moving into apprenticeship in a science center, employment in an action center, attendance for as much time as they cared at a critical university, or enrollment in a technical university. There's no reason why such organizations could not share important and expensive facilities like libraries and computers.

The interesting thing about this strange proposal is that each part of it is already happening in a small way. Semi-autonomous centers of research, training only their own replacements, are going up both inside and outside universities. Action centers are commonplace, although they have usually been set up as hapless appendages of more prestigious organizations. The demand for critical universities shows up not only in the "free universities" which have sprung up throughout the country, but also in the extremely popular extension programs carried on by most large universities. And if we did not insist upon imposing the liberal arts model on them, many of our professional schools would have gone much farther than they have so far in the kind of meshing of theory and practice my proposal implies. We have organized our colleges and universities so that these have just barely prospered despite the existing organization, not because of it.

If this reshaping of the university actually were to occur, what would it imply for women within the university? Let me say at once that I have no special expertise on the position of women; all I have to offer is some very general speculation. It does seem to me, first of all, that if the kinds of changes I've been talking about were to come about, they would significantly affect the educational opportunities of American women. For one thing, they would make it much more difficult for anxious parents to send off their adolescent daughters to have them certified as cultivated and marriageable. Because some higher education would be available for everyone and a pre-packaged bachelor's degree available to no one, some of the snobbism of a college education would disappear.

More important, the educational arrangements I have in mind break with the assumption that everyone will enter a lockstep educational experience at about the same age, work through at about the same pace, and finish his education with 30 or 40 years of his or her life ahead. The continuity of one form of educational experience or another through the

lifetime, and the mixture of tempos, ages, and career lines coming into any particular branch of education, could make it relatively easy for persons who have stopped studying to devote themselves to childbearing, or have taken a long time to decide that a particular professional career was attractive, to take up the education of their choice.

Third, the variety of paths and tempos should reduce one of the grounds for discrimination against women in graduate schools: namely, the fear that they will drop out for marriage or childbirth and thus "waste" the large investment put into them. I don't, however, see the structure of the arrangements as a general cure for sexism.

The system of education I have described is very much open to choice, and it's conceivable that women as a whole would make choices that would separate their paths from those of men even more than they are today. For example, if some patterns prevailing in middle class America today continued into this new era, one could very well imagine the science center as being an almost exclusively male domain, and the critical university as heavily populated by women over 30, while the men singlemindedly pursued their work elsewhere. I would deplore that outcome, and fight against it, but nothing about the system guarantees that it would not occur. Even if it did, I would prefer the arrangements I described to those we endure today.

That small glimmer of realism reminds me that we ought to make a distinction between possibilities and probabilities. There are some good reasons for expecting very little of what I have described actually to take place in the near future. As I said at the beginning, many people are contending for the services of the University and acquiring vested interest in the way they now do their work. Outside colleges and universities we have the consumers of the services those institutions have come to provide: the relatively small number of consumers of certification—guarantees of docility, pedigrees of previous selection, symbols of prestige, and so on—the parents who want custodial care for their young during the difficult years of late adolescence, the purchasers of research, engineering, and advice, the borrowers of the prestige of the higher learning. And inside, many of us also have an investment in the provision of those services in more or less their present form. In fact, during recent angry discussions about possible reorganizations of the university, I have been amazed to see what a wide range of people remain fixed to the notion that the central activity of colleges and universities should be to provide a certified "liberal education," so that the most radical proposals turn out to be the demand that a wider range of experiences be placed within that very traditional format.

A final and fundamental source of resistance to the kind of change I am sketching is that most of the resources necessary for carrying out the work of the university—and notably, the hard cash—are in the hands of people

58

outside the colleges and universities and are only fed into education subject to their approval.

So what are the probabilities? Very different from what I have suggested. First, the expansion and conglomeration of present universities, with new ones being created in the conglomerate image of the old. Second, increasing discontent with the scale, bureaucratic complexity, and internal contradictions of those monstrous institutions, leading to repeated attempts–mostly abortive–to remedy them through decentralization, debureaucratization, and loosening of requirements. Third, the proliferation of alternative paths through the maze, combined with a dogged insistence on labeling and certifying those paths as if they were somehow equivalent. Fourth, the relatively unnoticed creation and expansion of institutions faintly like the ones proposed before–technical universities, action centers, and so on–within the rigid limits on their autonomy set by their location within existing colleges and universities. In fact much more of this is going on outside the universities and colleges, with, for example, a RAND Corporation applying its expertise in operations research to urban problems, or a Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research taking on a few students and becoming an exclusively graduate university. Or, as youth and the youthful organize free universities with more life (if not more longevity) in them than the institutions next door. I'm not sure what the implications of these probable trends are for women in higher education; that's what we have to work out.

But there is one more thing I am fairly sure about; that is, that the organization and activities of institutions of higher learning will continue to change over the decades to come, that many of the changes will occur in response to the pressures and enticements of actual or potential consumers of the services provided by those institutions, and that at least some of the successful pressure will come from organized groups, which so far have had only minor impact on the over-all organization of colleges and universities. Organized black people are highly likely to be in that number, organized opponents of war and organized youth, quite possibly, and organized women would be a major force for change in the structure of American higher learning. Thorstein Veblen's telling, sardonic book, *The Higher Learning in America,* came out half a century ago. The scale of organization it describes strikes a contemporary reader as delightfully antique, but the structure he satirizes is still surprisingly with us. It need not be with us much longer.

Change for Women – Glacial or Otherwise?

Jean Campbell

We asked Mr. Tilly to take a broad view of the possibilities for change in higher education in the next decade–to stimulate our thinking about the general problem of coeducation, which President Angell defined around the turn of the century as "the democratic disposition to offer equal educational opportunities so far as possible to every human being." I think Mr. Tilly has succeeded brilliantly, just in time to lift us from our close concentration on the strains and tensions women feel in coping with the system as we know it. At the same time, as Mr. Tilly has said, he has not examined especially closely the situation of women, and in a moment I would like to touch on some of the implications for them in his "reflections."

But first let me talk a little about where we are now–about the present state of the University and women–as transition to a consideration of Mr. Tilly's idea–ideal or probable reality–of the university of the future.

We are learning more about the psychology and physiology of women, about socialization and changing cultural arrangements. Some of us think we may be able to plan better, to counsel with more insight, to encourage roles that will use the strengths unique to women–if such there are, and I think there are–as we learn more. It is exciting to observe the greater dignity suddenly attaching to good research about women. This change is demonstrated convincingly here at Michigan as the number of excellent research studies grow. One thing we may count on in the next decade is an increasing volume of distinguished research on the nature, development, and education of women. Research will help us understand, but I cannot imagine any research that would or should deter woman's aspirations to achieve whatever she is committed to, nor any counseling that would use research results to discourage achievement.

The problem we have been discussing this afternoon–and the message from articulate women generally–is that whatever systems of higher education exist, and however they may change in the next decade, women want freedom of choice within the system and a ready access to it. Many women–maybe most–have chosen traditional fields where they have met few barriers. Others, as we have heard, feel discrimination and hostility or

lack of understanding at best. And they want not to experience this pain and frustration as they pursue their goals.

Writing in *The American Scholar,* Elizabeth Cless says, "Many women opt out of higher education rather than risk the emotional punishment incurred by a woman who dares to enter a system built by men for men." I would not put it quite that way but perhaps it is valid. In any case most of this day we have been demonstrating the capacities of women who have not opted out. We have witnessed distinguished accomplishments in the work and in the persons of the participants. These are women of achievement. We have heard something about the barriers to achievement. Some of the graduate students have encountered the believers of the myths about women, the invalid assumptions of their inability to accomplish or stay with goals, of a lack of seriousness, a lack of commitment. Attitudes are generally unsupportive in traditionally male fields or in higher levels of academia. As one of our new Ph.D.'s said the other day, "The departments think women are like men—but ten per cent less on all counts." In any case, women frequently meet an uncomprehending query, "Why are you trying to do this?" meaning, "Why don't you stay home?" And our women of achievement have felt the conflict and their own fluctuating self-esteem and need for affiliative support.

The attitudes that govern the procedures and structures of American higher education are not consciously inhumane, of course; they are "discriminatory by inheritance." Undoubtedly there is discrimination as well as discriminatory attitudes on campus, but the point here is not to belabor the question of discrimination or alleged discrimination but to observe that with all their struggles on the college campus, women are not in leadership positions in the University and rarely anywhere. Kate Millett has been quoted as saying that all women seeking a career must overcome "the enemy within"—a self-doubt which she says is imposed by history and society. It has become a truism and our experience at the Center reinforces it: self-doubt in women is universal. This handicap of socialization makes it doubly important to look at the structure of higher education and create a more rational instrument—one that better meets the individual and social needs of women as well as all students.

Having got to this point and thinking about some of the comments made by the graduate student panel, I would like to extricate myself in part from the alarm criers because I think things are getting slightly better for women, at least at The University of Michigan, though perhaps not yet in the marketplace.

Patrick Moynihan, in an article in the summer issue of *The Public Interest* writes, "Fashions of thought get set, and for a period at least they prevail. Evidence to the contrary is treated not as information but as wrongdoing." In this sense I am about to indulge in some wrongdoing and give evidence for the institution and its capacity to respond and change.

WOMEN ON CAMPUS

The Center for Continuing Education of Women was created in 1964 out of just such pressure as Mr. Tilly talks about—"the pressures and enticements of consumers." ("Enticement" is the better word. In 1964, there was nothing like an organized constituency of women forming a pressure group, and no one predicted then even the modest degree of organization and unity that has sprung up within the last year.) As most of you know, the Center was designed to help women with their special set of problems in a University not made for them, and to represent their needs to the University with the expectation that it would respond. It was and is, in fact, a "change agent." I do not wish to make a case for the amount of change we may have effected; I want to establish the fact that the University has responded to a recognized need to do more for its women students.

As we know, problems for women are complex and many of the barriers to a freedom of action are in the general cultural context, but an education for women or men who anticipate multiple roles, requires a break in the lock-step of timing. Perhaps the most important University action has been the Dean's Committee policy of 1965, stating that women with family responsibilities need not take a course load beyond their capacity to perform successfully, regardless of other policies on enrollment and admissions. The same policy statement encourages graduate departments to admit women on a part-time basis by exempting such women from departmental quotas when they exist. It also justifies the availability of financial assistance to part-time students.

Such a policy may become less important as higher education is rationalized, perhaps on Mr. Tilly's model, but right now as enrollment pressures grow, not lessen, it is crucial to equality of educational opportunity.

The University honors credits of any age earned at accredited universities and colleges. At The University of Michigan a woman may establish her own residency for in-state fees. In this case a wife need not "follow her husband." Students who have family responsibilities qualify as having "full-time jobs" wherever such a designation has significance for fees or course loads. Student wives and working women and women with children may take credit courses toward their degrees in the evening—in groups essentially formed by women like themselves—women with multiple responsibilities.

The changes I have been talking about—and many others—have made a real difference to hundreds of women. These changes have come about at least partly because the Center is applying a steady, consistent pressure in behalf of individual women, and, when the need is apparent, in behalf of a change that will benefit all women.

Center counseling endeavors to widen the sense of the possible for women, to encourage and support whatever realizable goal a woman

chooses, and to help her to a clear-sighted view of what is ahead–not to discourage her, but to strengthen her.

The Center has primarily benefited "returning women," but all women (and men, too) are welcome. High on our agenda is doing more about our concern for young women who need to plan ahead for a stretched-out education, not opt out from strain or fear–"of success" or anything else. As Mrs. Houser has so eloquently pointed out, the situation for women in the next decade will be fundamentally affected by the need to control population. Evidence already indicates a marked drop in the number of children women expect to have. In a very real sense women are not abandoning their traditional roles; they are being abandoned as the role diminishes. In any case the pill will aid the worker and the scholar–and the student couple–all those who have the foresight and motivation to plan ahead for a satisfying life style.

Today the Center efforts of the '60's are joined and strengthened by the newer activist groups, similarly concerned for equality of opportunity but impatient with the pace of change and the apparent low priority of attention to problems of great salience to women.

I must say I rather hate to turn the discussion to the future, because I don't know anything about the future. But let us begin. We will surely in the next decade be doing some of the things we now only talk about. We might anticipate greater interchangeability of credits among institutions–even a mechanism to make it less painful. For example, there will be greater attention to the "open" university. England has long experience with external students and New York State is pioneering the state university without campus. We might anticipate some better assessment of experience in relation to the goals of education. We can hope for the disappearance of frankly discriminatory admissions practices or at least for an increasing number of women in medicine, law, and other fields now conspicuously selective.

We may expect a burgeoning cycle of women's studies programs, in the spirit of compensation for ignorance, on the black studies model.

The University will be cooperating with other institutions to see that higher education is more readily available to women in all parts of the state. Regional arrangements will make this possible and combinations of independent study, television and newer electronic devices will facilitate the out-reach service.

We can expect some increase in day care arrangements. Perhaps by 1980 day care will be universally a part of the public school system or will be a separate public education system. I would like to make a guess here from our experience. The educated woman, knowing the importance to development of very early childhood years, is likely to continue thinking she is a better guardian of those years than any reasonably full-time sub-

stitute. For this and more telling economic reasons I would not anticipate sufficient political pressure to provide tax-supported day care to relieve middle-class women for full-time study or work. Nevertheless, I hope quality day care arrangements will be available at the University for all women whose employment or career plans militate against even a few years of part-timeness.

Speaking of fashions in thought—as I was a long time ago—we are witnessing a momentary down-turn in public attention to the importance of professional and technical jobs with flexible or less-than-full-time hours, as the attention to day care increases. A causal connection would be difficult to establish, but in the next decade there will be, I feel sure, renewed emphasis on mechanisms to support a combination of roles during the period of child-rearing, with less waste in the educational investment made in highly-educated mothers. From all we know about women and how they learn and what they see as the ideal life style, I would hope for, if not predict, a renewed effort to fit institutions—both for training and for employment—to the demands of the nurturing role.

It is impossible to know how undergraduate career interests will change in a decade. A very large percentage are in the traditional mold now. Our experience bears out the sparse data indicating that women's career interests change when they return to school, essentially in the late twenties or early thirties. In the main they are interested in working with people in a rather direct way. Continuing progress in revising curricula and institutional arrangements to bring students in closer touch with social or governmental needs will be an important contribution to progress in women's education in the next decade, if it does not mean at the same time that other paths will remain closed. President Fleming suggested in his report to the faculty last month that the college should look to its role in creating greater responsiveness to community needs and suggested that such programs might end in the master's degree. This seems similar to the proposal made by Professor Reiss last year for a School of Applied Social Science and in functional intent not far from some of Mr. Tilly's thinking.

Were the college to define an applied social science school (undergraduate or with a terminal master's) we would be forced to define some of the new roles for which there is now very little connection between training and need but in which adult women are interested. I have seen a number of women, for example, who want to use the arts in reaching disturbed children. There is no program. I know a handful of women who like their own adolescent children and want to counsel adolescents through the crisis points. There is no program. Many adult women are most interested in learning on the job—in jobs that affect change in community services. A closer connection between training and employment is effective education and the proper province of a school of applied social science.

One of the exciting prospects for the next decade is this identification of roles that exploit the special qualities that are female–just as exciting as opening male-dominated professions to women. Practically speaking, an important job for several years in the next decade will be just to keep the door open for all who are motivated and know where they are going. We have been attracted by Yale President Kingman Brewster's concept of the "volunteer campus" which envisions a free flow of students in and out of college–but only in college when it makes sense to them. This is not far from the present pattern for women.

Now, in 1970, we are asking what more the University can and should do for women. What does educating women mean at The University of Michigan? Who is thinking about it? Some students, a few faculty, a researcher here and there, the Center. Women want and need a higher priority of attention. And they are getting it through the current Health, Education and Welfare Department investigation of discrimination in University employment. It is important, it seems to me, to translate the investigation from nuisance value to the record-keepers to creative concern. I will propose to Mr. Fleming that an all-University committee, including administrators, members of the faculty, staff, and students of varying ages, be appointed to assess the status of women and women's education at The University of Michigan and to recommend policies or action.

We have indicated some trends that will facilitate women's education and achievement in the next decade. Many of these changes and new directions clearly can be classified in Mr. Tilly's terms as "tinkering with the system" and fall somewhere in his vision of "probabilities for the future" which may be shaped by the "pressures and enticements of consumers"–in this case, women. In so far as constituency pressure brings about the changes we can foresee, women presumably will be increasingly alert and active in shaping institutions to their special needs.

But what about the future of women in the idea of a university to which Mr. Tilly has given the greater part of his discussion? His concept obviously has logic, given the realities we are accustomed to and would minimize some of our graver problems–i.e., forcing more and more reluctant youngsters to college simply for credentials or status, wasting educational investment because of rigidities in reentry or other barriers to continuing education, separating theory and practice.

But, as he says, nothing prevents sexism in this abstract system, and women would have to protest as much for equal access to his science center as they do today for medical school. The women who hope to introduce some "affirmative action" into the present system to equalize opportunities will not feel sanguine about a system that offers no better guarantee that the struggle will be lessened.

A functional division of the kind proposed, when formalized, surely invites elitism and separatism. This danger is compounded by the consolidation of general education into the high school.

Mr. Tilly warns us: "It's conceivable that women as a whole would make choices that would separate their paths from men even more than they are today. . . one can very well imagine the science center's being an almost exclusively male domain and the critical university heavily populated by women over 30 while the men singlemindedly pursued their work elsewhere." One "can well imagine" but why should one?

We can suggest that a model for the future that does not take into account women's life styles and problems and which destines her to a leisure (non-functional) education more or less inevitably by "some patterns prevailing in middle class America today" is not fully adequate. A model educational system would anticipate compensation for the effects of social and cultural attitudes as long as these attitudes preserve inequality of opportunity and the consequent waste of human resources.

About the Speakers

Judith M. Bardwick (B.S., Purdue; M.A., Cornell; Ph.D., University of Michigan) Assistant Professor of Psychology, introduced the first course in the Psychology of Women at the University in 1964. Her recent research explores the relationships between biological changes and personality development in women. Her book, *The Psychology of Women,* will be published this year. Dr. Bardwick is married and the mother of two children.

Jean W. Campbell (B.S., M.A., Northwestern) has been Director of the Center for Continuing Education of Women at The University of Michigan since its opening in 1964. A member of the newly-founded Commission on the Status of Women at The University of Michigan, and of the National Coalition for Research on Women's Education and Development, Mrs. Campbell has spoken widely on subjects related to women's educational problems. She is married, the mother of three children, grandmother of one.

Elizabeth Douvan (A.B., Vassar College: M.A., Ph.D., University of Michigan) Professor of Psychology and holder of the Catherine Neafie Kellogg Chair, co-authored with J. Adelson *The Adolescent Experience;* with Martin Gold, *Adolescent Development;* and with Bardwick, Gutman and Horner, *Feminine Personality and Conflict.* She is married and the mother of two teen-age children.

Greer Litton Fox (B.A., Randolph-Macon Woman's College; M.A., Ph.D., University of Michigan) is an Instructor in Sociology at Bowling Green State University (Ohio). Her professional interest is in the family as a social institution, with special interest in the roles and relationships of women. She is co-author with David Goldberg of "Family Planning in Turkey: Observations and an Interpretative Scheme," and is now preparing for publication "A Theoretical Framework for the Analysis of the Student Careers of Graduate Student Women."

D. Diane Hatch (B.A., Brigham Young University; M.A., Ph.D. candidate, University of Michigan) has been a teaching fellow in the Department of Psychology at The University of Michigan and Research Scientist at the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching while completing her

dissertation on "The Differential Impact of College on Males and Females."

Matina Souretis Horner (A.B., Bryn Mawr; M.S., Ph.D., University of Michigan) now teaches at the Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. Her doctoral dissertation was written on "Sex Differences in Achievement Motivation and Performance in Competitive and Non-Competitive Situations" (unpublished, 1968), and she is the author of several research papers on achievement motivation in women. Dr. Horner is married and the mother of three young children.

Carolyn A. Houser (B.A., Earlham College; M.A., Ph.D. candidate, University of Michigan) has edited and co-authored several books and articles in her field of public health and population planning, including a textbook on teaching family planning in medical schools. Mrs. Houser is chairman of the Committee to Establish a Commission on the Status of Women in Washtenaw County, and is the mother of two sons.

Noel Anketell Kramer (B.A. Vassar College, candidate for J.D., University of Michigan Law School) has served as president of the Women Law Students' Organization and an editor of the *Michigan Law Review.* Married to a Harvard Law School student, Mrs. Kramer plans to join a corporate law firm in Washington, D.C., when her studies are completed.

Grace E. Mack (B.S., Morgan State College; M.S., Howard University; Ph.D. candidate, University of Michigan) is a Departmental Associate in the Department of Psychology and a research assistant in the Institute for Social Research at The University of Michigan. She is also a teaching fellow in the Center for Afro-American and African Studies, and is a leader in the Black Students Psychological Association.

Sybil Stokes (B.A., Cornell; M.A., Yale University) has been Research Associate at the Institute of Public Policy Studies at The University of Michigan, where she specialized in research and writing in comparative public administration. She is married and has two daughters.

Charles Tilly (A.B., Ph.D., Harvard) came to The University of Michigan in 1969 from the University of Toronto, as Professor of Sociology and History. He has written mainly on urbanization, migration, the form of cities and on political conflict in Europe and America. During 1970-71 he is a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, where he and his wife, Louise, a European historian, are collaborating on a book comparing the evolution of political conflict in several European countries since 1930.

New Research on Women
At The University of Michigan

Judith Birnbaum, "Life Patterns, Personality Style and Self-Esteem in Gifted Family-Oriented and Career-Committed Women." Ph.D. thesis in Clinical Psychology, 1971.

In this study of married professional, single professional and traditional homemakers among high-achieving women college graduates, a major finding was that homemakers who have not worked outside the home since having had children have significantly lower self-esteem than married, career-committed professional women with children, or even than single professional women.

The homemakers more often tended to rate their general mental and emotional health as only poor to average, feel more lonely, and are more likely to miss a sense of challenge and of creative involvement in their lives, feel less attractive to men, and feel less certain of who they are and what to do with themselves at this middle point in their lives.

Marjorie Lansing, "Sex Differences in Political Participation." Ph.D. thesis in Political Science, 1970.

A study of the politicizing of American women since 1920, based on national sample surveys of five presidential elections. When women leave traditional female environments and enter the labor force or enroll in higher education, thier political behavior increases. A higher level of education has affected women's political behavior more than men's, and this rise in educational attainment of American women parallels a decline in political sex differences.

Sandra Tangri, "Role Innovation in Occupational Choice Among College Women." Ph.D. thesis in Social Psychology, 1969.

College-educated women who enter male-dominated professions are likely to be autonomous, individualistic and motivated by internally imposed demands to perform to capacity—more so than are college women who choose traditional occupations. These and many other findings are reported in this study of the background, personality and college experience characteristics of role-innovative women.